

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78700
Title of the Manuscript:	Overview on Renovascular Hypertension
Type of the 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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

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>This review article on Renovascular HT has the following suggestions to improve its Scientific content..</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.A paragraph on Bed side assessment – Describe Renal artery Bruit , its location, differentials and false positives and negatives. 2.Doppler study – Highlight the differential features of Aortic/RA findings vs Peripheral doppler study of intra renal arteries . The latter is easier to obtain and Parvus , tardus pattern should raise suspicion 3. In a patient with CKD and RVHT ,performing contrast angiogram could lead to Acute renal failure . Mention the usefulness of Non contrast MR Angiogram. Its sensitivity and specificity should be highlighted 4. In the therapy section, discuss the importance of high doppler Resistivity index in predicting renal fibrosis. Revascularisation will not improve the renal prognosis in such cases. 	
Minor REVISION comments	Spelling mistakes should be corrected [edema is spelt as edoema] Language editing is indicated	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Krishnaswamy Sampathkumar
Department, University & Country	Meenakshi Mission Hospital and Research Centre, India