

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nephrology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRN_111958
Title of the Manuscript:	Hematuria revealing a nutcracker syndrome in the nephrology department of the CHU Ibn Rochd in Casablanca: about 2 cases and review of the literature
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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Due to the nature of case report studies, I was expecting reports on rare symptoms of nutcracker syndrome, or special diagnoses and management of the disease. However, the present study only reports on two cases of Nutcracker syndrome with hematuria, which is the most common finding of this syndrome, and with the common demographic characteristics of this syndrome. Additionally, the literature review only included old studies, which cannot meet the needs of the scientific community.</p> <p>No, I suggest "Hematuria as a Common Symptom of the Nutcracker Syndrome; Two Case Reports and a Mini-Review"</p> <p>The abstract of the study appears to be relatively brief and predominantly centers on the topic of nutcracker syndrome. However, it lacks clarity in terms of stating the main objective of the research and providing a detailed explanation of the patients involved in the study. Moreover, the conclusion of the study seems to be missing, which could have been helpful in providing a more comprehensive understanding of the findings.</p> <p>Not bad but could be better and more coherent.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>The references cited in the literature review are outdated, rendering them irrelevant to the current research. Additionally, the quality of writing in this section falls short of expected standards, with many important and up-to-date studies being overlooked. To address these shortcomings, it is recommended that the literature review be revised to incorporate new and relevant sources of information.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English quality was good, but it's recommended to have it reviewed by a native speaker.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Soroush Khojasteh-Kaffash
Department, University & Country	Birjand University of Medical Sciences, Iran