

**Review Form 3**

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Nephrology</a>         |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_AJRN_125832  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | The spectrum of kidney biopsy findings in HIV-infected patients |
| Type of the Article      | Short communication   |

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|---|--|---|
| <p><b>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.</b></p>                        | <p>Even if it is a short communication, the article is of current scientific interest.</p> <p>There are numerous studies on this topic that still raise many discussions in the literature.</p> <p>I believe that the article can be published after substantial improvements, which I will detail below.</p>  |   |
| <p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>  | <p><b>Yes the title is suitable</b></p>  |   |
| <p><b>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.</b></p>   | <p>The abstract is comprehensive, but it is too long for short communication. Only the data about the study group and the histological results of the biopsies can be kept</p>   |   |
| <p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>  | <p><b>The structure of the manuscript is appropriate</b></p>   |   |
| <p><b>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.</b></p> | <p><b>The manuscript is scientifically good but must be improved</b></p> <p>Abbreviations can only be used after they are defined for the first use</p> <p>Mean, average and median are used inconsistently – the authors must to use only mean or only average – it not sound scientifically. Median is more specific for the statistically approach.</p> <p>Figure 1 must contain the % on the pie and when explain the figure to and number of patients too. Or authors can use 3D columns for a better figure understanding.</p> <p>At Chapter discussions author should include discussions about the results of them study too not only general literature discussions. Can be added reviews, systematic reviews or meta- analysis</p> |   |

### Review Form 3

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b><br>- | <b>Only 4 references is to short<br/>Most recently references should by added</b><br><b>e.g.</b> Ekrikpo UE, Kengne AP, Bello AK, Effa EE, Noubiap JJ, Salako BL, Rayner BL, Remuzzi G, Okpechi IG. Chronic kidney disease in the global adult HIV-infected population: A systematic review and meta-analysis. PLoS One. 2018 Apr 16;13(4):e0195443. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0195443. PMID: 29659605; PMCID: PMC5901989. |  |
| <u>Minor REVISION</u> comments<br><br><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>              | English language needs improvement   |  |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments  | With the recommendations I made article can be publish.  |  |

### **PART 2:**

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> (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) |
| <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>Cristian Iorga</b>  |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Davila Teaching Hospital of Nefrology, University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Romania</b> |