

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJRID_118104
Title of the Manuscript:	KNOWLEDGE OF ASSOCIATED RISK FACTORS OF CHRONIC KIDNEY DISEASE AMONG SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS IN ANAMBRA STATE NIGERIA.
Type of the Article	Original

**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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Though it is not absolutely necessary, it can play a role in educating or disseminating the knowledge of CKD to the public at large.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Fine</p> <p>The authors have provided purpose of the study, research question, hypothesis and null hypothesis. All these could have been avoided and stated concisely as objectives of the study. In the results section, all the data and the test of significance are provided separately. It could have synthesized in a same table to make the manuscript concise and easily comprehensible. Discussion section lacks in-depth analysis of the results with the existing literature. Recommendations are not appropriate.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>In general, the manuscript is well written. The language standard is high.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>S. Manickam</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Karpaga Vinayaga Institute of Medical Sciences &amp; Research Centre, India</b>