

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_98765
Title of the Manuscript:	The effect of intraoperative fluid therapy on postoperative renal functions in patients undergoing hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy and cytoreductive surgery
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. YES</p> <p>2. Title should include type of study. Also, I would suggest authors to study effects of intraoperative fluid therapy on not only renal function but also outcome as well</p> <p>3. Aim of the study is not clear and needs a better definition.</p> <p>4. Many spelling mistakes and grammar mistakes throughout abstract and manuscript</p> <p>5. One need to use term now Acute Kidney Injury and not failure</p> <p>6. Definition of AKI should be as per recent KDIGO definition.</p> <p>7. Introduction should suffice rationale of study and again this study needs definite aim.</p> <p>8. Endpoints of the study are not clear</p> <p>9. In results, more data is needed for those who had AKI, those who could not be extubated and need to assess risk factors for so.</p> <p>10. Also, patients who needed colloids and vasopressors needs to be discussed in detail</p> <p>11. A better table including all above should be presented</p> <p>12. In discussion, authors should put a comparative data of similar such studies</p> <p>13. Also look at outcome who required colloids, vasopressor.</p> <p>14. Limitations of the study needs to be written</p> <p>15. Conclusion should be related to aim of your study and needs to be rewritten</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Lots of spelling and grammar mistakes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kinnari Vala
Department, University & Country	Gujarat University of Transplantation Sciences, India