

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Advances in Nephrology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJANR_81695
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of some kidney and liver function markers in humans exposed to pesticides in Okagwe and Ihe-Nta, Abia State, Nigeria
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:

(<https://www.journalijanr.com/index.php/IJANR/editorial-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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The manuscript is, in general, very well written, with grammar consistent with what the authors want to convey, without any repetition of expression, in addition to a running text with great cohesion and coherence. - Topics are well distributed and so are subtopics, giving fluidity to the text and making it easier for readers to read and understand the message being conveyed. - The topic addressed in the study is of fundamental importance, first for the local population who live the reality of agricultural work with the use of pesticides, but who at the same time do not have the knowledge about the possible harms of this, as well as for the world scientific literature which should take this and other similar studies as an example to address this issue in their local realities, favoring measures to combat the damage caused by pesticides of the most diverse classes to the human body. - The methodology adopted in the manuscript, as far as is understood, is in accordance with the desired results. In addition, the authors, when detailing the entire methodological procedure, facilitate its adoption in other future studies, contributing a lot to the area. - Finally, the literature cited throughout the text reflects the authors' concern for the search for scientific studies similar to the one addressed in their work and brings comparative results of fundamental importance offering readers a greater overview of various results on the topics addressed. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>It is recommended or is there any doubt as to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Define, if possible and if important, the number of male and female individuals who were actors in this study. It is known that the borderline acceptable levels of some biological markers change in relation to the gender of the individual being used as an example. -- In the 'Introduction' topic, a brief summary could be made about what each of the liver and kidney function markers analyzed later on is about. Thus, by correlating the results of the present study with other referenced manuscripts, the importance of markers would already be known and the results better understood. - The topic 'Conclusion' is too short. Maybe write a little more about the results achieved, exploring the six tables present in the study that are full of relevant information. 	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alan Kelbis Oliveira Lima
Department, University & Country	University of Brasília, Brazil