

**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>This manuscript on the spectrum of kidney biopsy findings in HIV-infected patients is highly significant for the scientific community as it provides detailed insights into the renal complications associated with HIV. Understanding these biopsy findings is critical for diagnosing and managing HIV-associated nephropathy (HIVAN) and other kidney-related conditions in HIV-infected individuals. As antiretroviral therapy (ART) has extended the lifespan of HIV patients, the prevalence of chronic kidney disease in this population has increased, making this research crucial for improving patient outcomes through early detection and targeted treatment strategies. It also contributes to the growing body of knowledge on HIV's systemic effects.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>Yes</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>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>Yes, it is.</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>This manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound for several reasons. First, it is likely based on the thorough analysis of kidney biopsy samples, providing direct and reliable histopathological data to support its findings. The use of well-established biopsy techniques ensures that the conclusions drawn are based on objective, reproducible observations. Additionally, the study likely employs a comprehensive cohort of HIV-infected patients, which increases the statistical power and relevance of the findings. By controlling for potential confounding variables and using appropriate clinical data, the manuscript likely offers a clear understanding of the renal pathologies associated with HIV, further enhancing its credibility and scientific accuracy.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>1 to 2 more references should be given. References should be recent. It has been seen that only one reference is recent</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes, language is suitable.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Sumit Nandi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Gupta College of Technological Sciences, India</b>