

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_129396
Title of the Manuscript:	MAJOR DEPRESSION IN CHRONIC KIDNEY DISEASE PATIENTS ATTENDING THE RENAL CLINIC IN A TEACHING HOSPITAL IN PORT HARCOURT NIGERIA.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 '**lack 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: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This study talks about nephrology and mental health by examining the prevalence and predictors of major depression among chronic kidney disease (CKD) patients in a Nigerian teaching hospital. It highlights key socioeconomic and clinical predictors, including financial support, employment status and CKD stages. These insights can help shape targeted screening and intervention programs to improve mental health outcomes in CKD patients, especially in resource-limited settings.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Major Depression in Chronic Kidney Disease Patients Attending the Renal Clinic in a Teaching Hospital in Port Harcourt, Nigeria," seems appropriate.	
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.	The objectives and methodology are concise, and key results and conclusions emphasized.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The research methodologies appear appropriate. Consider adding 1–2 lines in the conclusion to highlight the broader clinical implications of the findings. Appears fine, some suggestions to improve are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly state how sample size was determined to strengthen methodological rigor. • Provide confidence intervals (CIs) along with odds ratios (ORs) for predictors in the results section. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Barring few grammatical errors, the language quality is suitable for publication.	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add a brief section on clinical recommendations for depression screening and intervention in CKD patients. • Include limitations regarding generalizability to other populations and reliance on PHQ-9 as a screening tool. 	

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:	Akshay Prashanth Giri
Department, University & Country	Sri Ramachandra institute of higher education and research, India