

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nephrology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRN_100689
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative study of secondary thrombotic microangiopathies associated with anticancer treatments in patients receiving gemcitabine and anti-VEGF
Type of the Article	Data 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.journalajrn.com/index.php/AJRN/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 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)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- This study is completely scientific and it is an interesting and valuable topic, but some points should be mentioned in order to solve the flaws of the article.1. The entire text of the introduction has only one reference, and unfortunately the referencing is not good.2. Title is not bad and the words should be written completely. It is better that be a short title as "Secondary thrombotic microangiopathies associated with anticancer treatments in patients receiving gemcitabine and anti-VEGF (completely)3. the abstract of the article is comprehensive but abbreviation of words is not suitable here and the words should be written completely.4. Yes5. Yes6. No.- The data collection method is not complete and it is not clear who collected it and from where.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
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 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fatemeh Ghani Dehkordi
Department, University & Country	Bushehr University of Medical Sciences, Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, Iran