Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJBCRR_110914**
Title of the Manuscript:	**ESTIMATION OF GLOMERULAR FILTRATION RATE USING THE NEW EKFC EQUATION IN HEALTHY AND SICK ADULT SUBJECTS FROM SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

Review Form 1.7

	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 1. **Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. **Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. **Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** 4. **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** 5. **Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** 6. **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	1. **This manuscript is important for scientific community as this allows the future development of a gender/race specific equations applicable across the world. The paper is concise and well written.** 2. **I would preferably change the word "sick" adult subjects with something more specific, such as patients with various stages of CKD.** 3. **The abstract is comprehensive, but the first sentence in the introduction about the first equation is actually redundant. Again, in the conclusion, perhaps change the word sick with a better term.** 4. **In M&M section the subheadings 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 can be merged under study design subheading. Similarly, there is no need for subheadings under the 2.4 methods section. Everything can be written as one text.** 5. **The manuscript is scientifically correct.** 6. **The references are sufficient and recent.**	
Minor REVISION comments 1. **Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	English quality could be slightly improved.	
Optional/General comments	**Introduction** First sentence – Cockroft and Gault formula is not the equation for estimating GFR, but for estimating creatinine clearance. Please give references for all of three mentioned equations (CG, MDRD, CKD-EPI). Please write the full texts of the abbreviations first time in the text, and give the abbreviations in parentheses. Give reference for the new EKFC equation, and provide a better explanation of the Q variable. Perhaps it would be valuable to list the equation in a form of a Table? Structure your aim in a manner "we aimed to evaluate the performance…". **Materials and methods** Please reorganize the subheadings as stated above. Perhaps the sentence that the blood was taken from the elbow was a bit clumsy. Maybe cubital vein would be better. Additionally, consider using the term fasting state instead of on an empty stomach. Please describe in more details the storage conditions, e.g. the stability of the analytes and the transportation condition. Please explain what is a dry tube? Provide a reference for mGFR method. Roche is written with a capital letter. Regarding statistical analysis – do all parameters follow the normal distribution? **Results** It would be useful to divide the participants by the gender. Why are parameters in Table 2. Listed	

both as means and medians? What is the distribution of the listed parameters? There is no need to repeat all the measured valued listed in the Table 2 also in the text. It is worth mentioning that most biases are not statistically significant as their respective 95% CI include zero. I don't understand what is IQR in the Table 2?

Discussion

Please revise the term sick people throughout the manuscript. Also, I would like to see the influence of storage and transportation on measured biomarkers in the discussion section. How do you explain better performance of the crea-cys equation, although biases were statistically significant for this combination of biomarkers?

	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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Vanja Radišić Biljak**
Department, University & Country	**University Hospital Sveti Duh, Croatia**