

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Advances in Nephrology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJANR_119059
Title of the Manuscript:	Paradigm shift in Membranous nephropathy
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript doesn't contribute anything additional in terms of the existing knowledge of membranous nephropathy. But it does bring forth the Indian scenario of biopsy proven membranous nephropathy. The article must be very elaborate in its clinical conclusions and should bring about a change in the practice pattern.</p> <p>The title doesn't seem appropriate- I would suggest" Clinicopathological profile of Membranous nephropathy-A single centre experience."</p> <p>The abstract is poorly written. Since it's an original research article, the abstract must be subdivided into introduction, objectives, methodology, results and conclusion in a concise manner.</p> <p>The manuscript lacks clarity on the need of this study and aims and objectives. The methodology is not detailed in terms of pathological processing and the techniques of immunostaining (PLA2R, NELL1, THSD7A). Clinical characteristics of patient including creatinine, albumin and proteinuria are lacking. Just histopathological findings make no impact unless corelated with clinical characteristics. If your aim was to include only primary NELL 1 then the following aspect should be mentioned in aims and objectives. THSD7A was positive in 3 patients- what are the clinical characteristics of these patients. Why were IgG1 levels evaluated??what is the clinical rationale behind it? What was the protocol used for Injection rituximab used in primary NELL1 MN? What were the serum PLA2R levels in the positive patients. The discussion lacks appropriate referencing in terms of previous studies and the new findings/differences in this study. NELL1 was treatment resistant as per your article. What definition of treatment resistance did you incorporate? The manuscript requires extensive revision to be accepted. Discussion looks too small and must elaborate the pertinent findings that will change the outlook and practice patterns in India. The sample size cannot be deemed small but efforts from authors side are required to incorporate clinical characteristics and analysis with histopathological profile for a comprehensive overview</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The English needs improvement and authors should take professional editing services to improve the language for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The article needs extensive revision and cannot be accepted in the present form. Novelty is not the requirement, but meaningful insights must be provided by a research manuscript. The authors have collected data, but they need to incorporate all their collected data to make it noteworthy for the scientific community</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gerry George Mathew
Department, University & Country	SRM Medical College Hospital and Research Centre, India