

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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is highly important for the scientific community because it sheds light on the prevalence and clinical characteristics of intradialytic hypertension (IDH), a condition that significantly impacts the quality of life and outcomes of patients undergoing maintenance haemodialysis. By providing data from a tertiary care center, it adds valuable information to a growing body of research on the Hemodialysis complications faced by dialysis patients. I appreciate this manuscript because it emphasizes a critical but often underreported issue, potentially guiding clinical interventions and improving patient care. Furthermore, it raises awareness about the need for monitoring and managing IDH to enhance patient outcomes.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title "Frequency and Clinical Profile of Patients with Intradialytic Hypertension on Maintenance Hemodialysis in a Tertiary Care Center" is clear and informative, effectively describing the scope of the study. However, it could be slightly refined for better readability and impact.</p> <p>A possible alternative title could be: "Prevalence and Clinical Characteristics of Intradialytic Hypertension in Maintenance Hemodialysis Patients at a Tertiary Care Center"</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article is generally well-written and provides a good overview of the study. However, it could benefit from greater emphasis on the main components, such as the background, methods, results, and conclusions. Highlighting these sections more clearly will ensure that readers can quickly grasp the key findings and significance of the study. Adding specific details about the methodology and summarizing the most critical results would improve the clarity and completeness of the abstract. Overall, it's a solid abstract that just needs a bit more focus on these key areas to enhance its effectiveness.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and well-organized, allowing for a clear presentation of the study's findings; however, to enhance the readability and visual appeal of the results section, it would be beneficial to include a graph to represent the table on categorical variables with frequency distribution percentages. This visual representation would make the data more accessible and easier to interpret for readers, complementing the textual and tabular data already provided. Additionally, comments that summarize and analyze the results presented in the tables could be expanded to enhance the reader's understanding of the findings.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound, as it is based on a well-defined research question and employs appropriate methodology to investigate the prevalence and clinical profile of intradialytic hypertension. The data collection and analysis processes seem thorough, ensuring that the conclusions drawn are supported by evidence. The manuscript also demonstrates an understanding of the clinical implications of the findings, contributing to a better understanding of Hemodialysis complications in dialysis patients. Overall, the rigorous approach to data analysis and the focus on a clinically relevant issue make this study scientifically valid.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>The references cited in the manuscript are generally sufficient, but incorporating more recent studies would strengthen the literature review and provide a more current context for the findings. Specifically, I recommend including recent references on complications during haemodialysis and the prevention of intra- and post-dialytic hypertensive crises by captopril. Additionally, studies addressing hemodynamic changes during haemodialysis and the effects of various medications on haemodialysis patients would further enhance the manuscript's relevance and comprehensiveness. These references will provide a more robust foundation for understanding the complexities of managing intradialytic hypertension in this patient population.</p>	

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 are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript is well-structured, and the scientific terminology is appropriately used throughout. However, minor grammatical issues and phrasing could be refined for improved clarity and flow. Overall, the article effectively communicates its findings, but a thorough proofreading or editing for language precision would enhance its professionalism and readability in a scholarly context.	
Optional/General comments	During the revision of the original article, we noticed a significant amount of word repetition, which can detract from the clarity and readability of the text. Repetition may cause redundancy and weaken the impact of key findings or points. It would be beneficial to reduce repetitive phrases and introduce more varied language to enhance the flow and ensure that the central messages are conveyed effectively. A more concise and polished presentation of the content will not only improve the overall quality of the article but also engage readers more effectively.	

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:	Mohamed Fakhry Ahmed Salem
Department, University & Country	Alexandria University, Egypt