

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Immunology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJI_127402
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A Review on Vadadustat: A Hope in treatment of Anemia patients having chronic kidney disease</b>
Type of the Article	Review Article

#### **General guidelines for the Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**Jack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/> Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### 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
<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>	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community because it explores vadadustat, a promising oral alternative to the traditional injectable erythropoiesis-stimulating agents (ESAs) for treating anemia in patients with chronic kidney disease (CKD). By targeting hypoxia-inducible factors (HIFs), vadadustat presents a novel approach that could streamline and improve the management of anemia in this patient population. The discussion around the safety and efficacy of vadadustat, particularly its potential effects on tumor growth through angiogenesis, is crucial for determining the broader implications of HIF-targeted therapies. I appreciate this manuscript for its comprehensive overview of the HIF system and its potential benefits, as well as its cautious exploration of safety concerns, offering a balanced perspective on a promising but still emerging therapy.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	yes	
<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>	the abstract is comprehensive, covering the mechanism, benefits, and potential risks of vadadustat. However, it could benefit from a clearer mention of clinical trial results to emphasize efficacy and safety, and a brief note on the potential impact on clinical practice for clarity	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	yes	
<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>	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound because it accurately details the biological mechanisms of anemia treatment, specifically through the role of hypoxia-inducible factors (HIFs) in erythropoiesis. It carefully explains the physiological pathways involved, such as iron metabolism and the regulation of erythropoietin (EPO) production, grounded in well-established scientific concepts. Additionally, the discussion of potential risks, including the implications of HIF activation on tumor growth, shows a balanced and cautious approach that aligns with current scientific research. The manuscript's reliance on data from clinical trials to support the efficacy and safety of vadadustat further solidifies its scientific credibility.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	yes	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	yes	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	no	

#### 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>Javaid Ahmad Mir</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Kashmir, India</b>