

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Advances in Nephrology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJANR_116917
Title of the Manuscript:	AN OBSERVATIONAL STUDY ON ETIOLOGY OF PROTEINURIA IN POSTRENAL TRANSPLANT RECIPIENTS IN A TERTIARY HOSPITAL OF NORTH INDIA
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>Yes</p> <p>The title is grammatically faulty and should be re-written to reflect the topic</p> <p>The abstract is poorly written and does not give any aim, objective, methodology or result achieved from the study</p> <p>All sections were poorly written. The introduction was sparse, giving very little information, the methodology was not comprehensive, results were poorly presented and the discussing was very minimal, not cohesively presenting the results while relating it with other studies carried out</p> <p>There are so many parts of the manuscript that are scientifically incorrect</p> <p>The references are sparse and do not follow any particular style</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English used is very poor</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The general manuscript was poorly written and results poorly presented. The authors need to rewrite the manuscript to improve it Statistical software used for analysis was not indicated, graphs were poorly presented and so were the charts Ethical consideration was not indicated</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:	Martha Orendu Oche Attah
Department, University & Country	Cyprus International University, Cyprus