

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Advances in Nephrology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJANR_125127
Title of the Manuscript:	FREQUENCY AND CLINICAL PROFILE OF PATIENTS WITH INTRADIALYTIC HYPERTENSION ON MAINTENANCE HEMODIALYSIS IN A TERTIARY CARE CENTER
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important as it highlights intradialytic hypertension, a complication that can negatively impact hemodialysis patients. It provides valuable data on the frequency and clinical profile of these patients, helping improve care protocols in similar settings. The findings contribute to the scientific community by offering insights that can guide better management of hypertension in dialysis. I appreciate its clinical relevance, though a stronger focus on long-term outcomes and interventions would enhance its impact.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is suitable as it clearly reflects the study's focus on the frequency and clinical profile of patients experiencing intradialytic hypertension in a tertiary care setting. It is concise and specific, giving readers a clear understanding of the manuscript's scope. However, to enhance clarity, an alternative title could be: "Prevalence and Clinical Characteristics of Intradialytic Hypertension in Patients on Maintenance Hemodialysis at a Tertiary Care Center". This version emphasizes both prevalence and characteristics, providing a broader view of the study's objectives.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is quite comprehensive and provides a thorough overview of the study's aim, findings, and clinical relevance. However, there are a few areas where improvements can be made to enhance clarity and conciseness: Strengths: 1. Objective and Importance: The abstract clearly states the objective of the study, highlighting the scarcity of Indian data on intradialytic hypertension (IDH). 2. Key Results: It effectively presents the prevalence of IDH (59.2%) and its significant associations with various factors such as dialysis frequency, medication use, and serum potassium levels. 3. Implications for Future Research: The suggestion to explore interventions with specific antihypertensive medications is valuable.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript appear appropriate. The key sections like Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion seem covered. However, the Results section may benefit from more concise presentation to avoid repetition, and a clearer Conclusion should be included to summarize clinical implications. A brief description of the study design in the Methods and a focused discussion on future interventions would strengthen the manuscript.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is scientifically robust as it provides detailed data on the prevalence and clinical characteristics of intradialytic hypertension (IDH) in an understudied Indian population. The study employs an observational design that is appropriate for identifying associations between IDH and various clinical factors, such as dialysis frequency and medication use, which are backed by statistical analysis. Additionally, it explores significant variables like serum potassium levels and blood pressure trends, which are relevant to understanding IDH. The findings align with established knowledge while highlighting unique regional insights, making it both technically sound and clinically valuable.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The sufficiency and recency of references should be evaluated based on their relevance to intradialytic hypertension (IDH) and the study's context. The manuscript has included recent research (preferably within the last 5-7 years) on IDH, its clinical outcomes, and management strategies, the references are likely sufficient. However, it would be helpful to include more recent studies on the role of antihypertensive medications in IDH, particularly in the Indian or similar settings, if not already covered.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article is clear, concise, and free of grammatical errors to be suitable for scholarly communication.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Anuj Dwivedi
Department, University & Country	Ranchi Cancer Hospital and Research Centre, India