

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Research in Nephrology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRN_122761</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Nephrotic syndrome revealing secondary syphilis in a 23-year-old student in sub-Saharan Africa and review of the literature</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Case reports</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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><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 provides valuable insights into the rare presentation of nephrotic syndrome secondary to syphilis. It highlights the importance of considering venereal diseases in the differential diagnosis of nephrotic syndrome, especially in regions with high prevalence rates of sexually transmitted infections. The case is well-documented, and the follow-up demonstrates a positive clinical outcome after appropriate treatment. However, the manuscript could benefit from a more detailed discussion on the pathophysiology linking syphilis to nephrotic syndrome and the potential implications for clinical practice in resource-limited settings.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>Yes, the title is suitable and accurately reflects the content of the manuscript.</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 could be improved by briefly mentioning the importance of early diagnosis and treatment in preventing severe complications associated with nephrotic syndrome secondary to syphilis.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</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>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The case report is well-documented, with a clear presentation of clinical findings, diagnosis, and treatment. The references are appropriate, and the discussion aligns with the current understanding of syphilis-related renal pathology. The manuscript effectively contributes to the existing literature on rare complications of syphilis and reinforces the need for heightened clinical awareness.</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>Yes, the references are sufficient and recent. They appropriately cover the key aspects of the topic.</p>	
<p><b><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</b></p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language is generally clear, but minor proofreading is recommended to correct a few grammatical errors and improve sentence structure for better readability.</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u> comments</b></p>	<p>The manuscript addresses a relevant clinical issue, and its publication could raise awareness among healthcare professionals, particularly in areas with limited access to advanced diagnostic tools. The authors are encouraged to add a brief section on the implications of this case for public health policies related to sexually transmitted infections.</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>Nguyen Thao Pham</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Hanoi Medical University, Vietnam</b>