

ReviewForm 1.7

Journal Name:	JournalofAdvancesinMedicineandMedicalResearch
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_JAMMR_114359
Titleofthe Manuscript:	VARIATIONINRENALPARAMETERSINDENGUEANDNON-DENGUEPATIENTS
TypeoftheArticle	OriginalResearch Article

ReviewForm 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write a few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is important because it provides valuable insights into renal implications caused by dengue virus infection. Improving the understanding of differences in renal parameters between patients with and without dengue can contribute to clinical and epidemiological knowledge, influencing medical practices, strategies for preventing complications, and the management of patients with dengue. 2. The title is appropriate. 3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive, but it lacks improvements in writing. 4. These sections and structure of the manuscript need to be organized. 5. The manuscript needs revisions. 6. The references are not sufficient and are mostly outdated. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>It is advisable that the article undergoes an English language review.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Next, I propose some improvements for the manuscript, which are also highlighted in the manuscript file.</p> <p>In the abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Insert the study's objective into a separate topic from the background. - Insert a period (full stop) after the study location - It is interesting to include the country where the study was conducted. - Was data collection carried out using medical records? Were they physical or electronic records? - Was the identification of patients without dengue also carried out in the same way? It is necessary to make this clear in the summary. - Not only regardless of severity but also of age group and gender. - It would be interesting to present these results showing the increase in percentages. <p>In the introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the introduction, the authors should better elucidate the research problem, providing a clear and concise explanation of why it is relevant to identify differences in renal parameters between patients with and without dengue. Additionally, they should discuss the potential consequences for the patient. In this context, acute kidney injury and its potential complications are addressed. 	

ReviewForm 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At the end of the introduction, authors should present the research problem and the study's objective. <p>In the Materials and methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The study is cross-sectional, so it is highly recommended that you use the STROBE checklist to ensure that all essential elements of your study are reported comprehensively and transparently. This contributes to the robustness and credibility of your work in the field of epidemiology. - Present how data collection occurred, the collection period, and which data were collected. - It is interesting to include the country where the study was conducted. - Insert a justification for why the study was conducted with a sample of 100 patients. - Were there any exclusion criteria? <p>In Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Instead of initiating the results with a table, it is more accurate to present the characteristics of the study population first. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In my view, there is no need for Table 1, as Table 2 presents the same data. Replace Table 1 with a table detailing the characterization of the patients. - Do the values in Table 1 consist of averages of the analyzed patients? - Insert a caption in the table with an explanation regarding the unit of measurement. - It would be interesting to present these results showing the increase in percentages <p>In discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The discussion needs to be better elaborated. The authors should carefully analyze each of the presented results, relying on updated scientific literature. It is crucial to discuss the found differences, addressing possible outcomes for the patient. In the discussion, the authors should explore how dengue causes these alterations in the patient and its complications on renal functions. - The discussion should begin with a paragraph providing an overall summary of the results. - At the end of the discussion, present the study's limitations. <p>In references:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support the introduction and the discussion with updated references 	
--	--	--

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:	Francisco Gerlai Lima Oliveira
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Ceara, Brazil