

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nephrology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRN_77834
Title of the Manuscript:	Epidemiological, clinical and evolutionary profiles of patients admitted in a dialytic emergency situation at the University Hospital of Brazzaville
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Abstract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introduction: the last sentence should be moved to new subheading as "Objectives" - Methods: the authors should indicate that the study patients were adult or including patients with any age - Result: the first sentence should be write as "incidence" not "frequency" - sex ratio of 2.13 did not make sense. The authors should indicate as the proportion of male or female patients. - Did you mean "The procedure chosen was ..." the procedure of choice? <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - paragraph 3: the patients could be male or female, then the authors should use "he or she develops clinically" - please check spelling for "hyperkalaemia" - paragraph 4: ... high cost of a dialysis session in a "center private". Did you mean the dialysis center in a private sector? <p>Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is study design analytical study or descriptive study as the authors discordantly mentioned in abstract and main text? - the study period that was informed in Abstract and main at methods are not matched. The authors should be check this information. - CFA Franc, ... Euro? - many abbreviations were used in the main text. The authors must write the full at the first seen in the main text and then use abbreviations everywhere in the main text. - please check the unit of serum creatinine - the definition of AKI should be followed KDIGO 2012 guideline for AKI, if the authors use other guidelines, then please provide the reference. <p>Result</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the authors should provide each 1 table for patient characteristics and dialysis information. It is easier for readers <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it is interesting to compared the main findings with developing countries in Latin America, South East Asia, or other part of the world - the authors should declare the strength of this work and also limitations 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the authors should inform about informed consent or IRB approval 	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the authors use both "emergency dialyses" and "dialytic emergency". this should be select only one and use along the line for entire manuscript - Abstract should be concise. The sentences for entire manuscript are too long and complicated. 	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Wanchana Singhan
Department, University & Country	Chiang Mai University, Thailand