

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Advances in Nephrology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJANR_126745
Title of the Manuscript:	Clinicians' preferences and perceptions of iron supplementation in the treatment of anemia in Indian settings: Emphasis on liposomal iron formulations
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	By highlighting the benefits of liposomal iron, such as enhanced bioavailability, higher plasma iron concentrations, and improved tolerability, the study offers valuable insights into the formulation's potential as a preferred therapeutic option. Given that anemia is a major public health concern, especially in Indian settings, the study's findings support the consideration of more effective treatment options in clinical guidelines. I appreciate the manuscript's focus on addressing patient challenges, such as gastrointestinal side effects from traditional iron supplements, and how these can be managed with newer formulations like liposomal iron.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suggested alternative title: "Clinicians' Preferences for Liposomal Iron in Treating Anemia: A Cross-Sectional Study in India" This alternative maintains the study's focus on clinicians' preferences for liposomal iron and the Indian clinical setting, while being slightly more concise.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Clarify the Methodology: The abstract should specify the types of clinicians surveyed (e.g., general practitioners, specialists), which would add context to the expertise level of respondents. Add Specific Findings on Hemoglobin Impact: The abstract mentions that liposomal iron increased hemoglobin levels, but specifying the extent or percentage improvement (if available) would make the results more concrete and impactful. Shorten Repetition and Improve Flow: In some places, similar points are repeated (e.g., high bioavailability and tolerability of liposomal iron). These could be consolidated to keep the abstract concise and focused.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The introduction is clear and provides a comprehensive overview of anemia as a global issue. The content is well-organized. You might consider adding a brief paragraph on the study's purpose or hypothesis at the end of the Introduction to transition smoothly into the Methods section. While the Results section is thorough, dividing it into subsections based on main outcomes (e.g., "Clinical Characteristics," "Iron Supplement Preferences," "Liposomal Iron Characteristics") may improve clarity. The manuscript has a logical flow, but breaking down lengthy paragraphs or using bullet points in the Results section (where applicable) could enhance readability.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The methodology is meticulously detailed, with appropriate ethical considerations and participant criteria, ensuring reproducibility and relevance to clinical practice. Additionally, the results are well-supported by statistical analyses and interpreted thoughtfully in the Discussion, where the findings are contextualized within existing literature, enhancing the manuscript's scientific credibility and relevance.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are largely sufficient and cover both foundational information on anemia and recent developments in anemia management, especially in relation to chronic kidney disease (CKD) and innovative treatments like liposomal iron. The inclusion of recent studies, such as those from <i>Lancet</i>	

Review Form 3

:	<i>Haematology</i> (2023), <i>Nephrol Dial Transplant</i> (2015), and <i>Kidney International Reports</i> (2022), reflects up-to-date findings and ensures the manuscript is grounded in current research.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article appears suitable for scholarly communication. The text is clear, with appropriate scientific terminology and a formal tone that aligns well with academic standards. Complex concepts are effectively conveyed, which would aid in the manuscript's comprehension by researchers and practitioners in the field.	
Optional/General comments	If possible, a section discussing the practical implications for clinicians, especially regarding the adoption of new treatments, could add value. This would bridge the gap between research findings and clinical practice. Expanding on the limitations of the study, as well as potential areas for future research, would strengthen the discussion. It would provide readers with a balanced view and open pathways for subsequent studies.	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mathanki Sutharsan
Department, University & Country	University of Jaffna, Sri Lanka