

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Advances in Nephrology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJANR_112484
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of kidney and liver functions in post COVID-19-Vaccinated Individuals in Rivers State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript aims to see effect of COVID-19 vaccine on liver and kidney parameters. This is an important issue.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The method section focuses on the lab tests and not the sampling technique. The result section only contains tables and diagrams. There is no description of result at all. The discussion section is also too limited.</p> <p>The sample size is too small to make any such comments.</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Quality can be improved</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The method section focuses on the lab tests and not the sampling technique. It is mentioned that the sample were taken conveniently. But there is no mention of sample size calculation. The result section only contains tables and diagrams. There is no description of result at all. Table 7 shows subgroup analysis for different age group, but the sample size in each age group ranges from 3 – 10. So any result from such table cannot be clinically significant regardless of the statistical significance. The discussion section is also too limited. Most of the statements made in the discussion section is not relevant as the sample size is one of the biggest limitations in this study. There is no mention of adequacy of sample size to make such conclusion.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Shreya Jha
Department, University & Country	AIIMS, India