Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJBCRR_125935**
Title of the Manuscript:	**VITAMIN D STATUS IN AFRICAN PATIENTS ON SUPPLEMENTED HEMODIALYSIS, FOLLOWED IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR IN CÔTE D'IVOIRE**
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
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.	**1. Relevant research topic: The study addresses an important issue in nephrology - vitamin D status in hemodialysis patients in Côte d'Ivoire. This is particularly relevant given the high prevalence of vitamin D deficiency in chronic kidney disease patients and its impact on bone health.** **2. Clear methodology: The authors provide a detailed description of their study design, patient selection criteria, and laboratory methods used for vitamin D measurement.** **3. Comparison with existing literature: The discussion section includes comparisons of the findings with other studies from both African and Western populations, providing context for the results.** **4. Consideration of compliance: The study examines the relationship between treatment compliance and vitamin D levels, which is an important practical consideration in patient care.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	**1. Limited sample size: With only 89 patients included, the study may lack statistical power to draw robust conclusions or perform more detailed subgroup analyses.** **2. Lack of control group: The absence of a control group of healthy individuals or non-supplemented hemodialysis patients limits the interpretation of the results.** **3. Cross-sectional design: The cross-sectional nature of the study prevents the assessment of causal relationships or long-term outcomes related to vitamin D status.** **4. Incomplete reporting of statistical analysis: The methods section lacks details on statistical tests used, and there is limited presentation of statistical significance for the reported findings.** **5. Inadequate discussion of potential confounders: Factors such as sunlight exposure, dietary intake, and comorbidities that could affect vitamin D levels are not adequately addressed.**	

Review Form 3

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.	**1. Expand sample size: Increase the number of participants to improve statistical power and allow for more robust subgroup analyses. For example, stratification by age, gender, or duration of dialysis could provide valuable insights.** **2. Include a control group: Incorporate a control group of either healthy individuals or non-supplemented hemodialysis patients to better contextualize the findings.** **3. Longitudinal design: Consider a prospective cohort study to assess changes in vitamin D status over time and its relationship with clinical outcomes.** **4. Enhance statistical analysis: Clearly describe the statistical methods used and report measures of statistical significance (e.g., p-values, confidence intervals) for key findings.** **5. Address potential confounders: Collect and analyze data on factors that could influence vitamin D levels, such as sunlight exposure, dietary intake, and comorbidities. For instance, use of a validated sunlight exposure questionnaire or dietary assessment tool could provide valuable additional information.** **6. Expand on clinical implications: Provide more detailed recommendations for clinical practice based on the findings, such as specific supplementation strategies or monitoring protocols.** **7. Improve data presentation: Use more informative tables and consider adding figures (e.g., a scatter plot of vitamin D levels vs. duration of dialysis) to better illustrate the results.** **By addressing these points, the authors could significantly strengthen the scientific rigor and clinical relevance of their study.**	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. **-**		
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Tamer A. Addissouky**
Department, University & Country	**Al-Hadi University College, Iraq**