

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Advances in Nephrology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJANR_115561
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Some Renal Function Parameters in Port Harcourt Residents Diagnosed with Varying Malaria Parasite Densities
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	 1. Yes! This study is done on a common condition(malaria) worldwide so it will be used as an eye-opener for malaria endemic areas 2. No! I recommend avoiding words like 'some'...I suggest “ Effect of Acute malaria on kidney functions.... ” 3. Yes! But just minor comments (malaria infected once are 30 or 31?)..17 +14=31?...may be good to put the results precisely (e.g: avoid sentences about sex .male..female issue just give more attention your results (malaria and renal function) 4. Yes! It seems the introduction is taking much space, description of the study area should give a comment about malaria...is that endemic for malaria?..” All participants in the study were without kidney complications or any organ dysfunction prior to the study’—this sentence is not clear, how do you know that all were not having renal problem? 5. Please revise the inclusion and exclusion criteria? Exclusion criteria is almost the opposite of inclusion criteria in this document which is not correct...ethical clearance is in question “ALL AUTHORS HEREBY DECLARE THAT ALL EXPERIMENTS HAVE BEEN EXAMINED AND APPROVED BY THE APPROPRIATE ETHICS COMMITTEE”....WHO GAVE THE ETHICAL CLEARANCE? INCLUDE IRB CLEARANCE NUMBER 6. I strongly advise to revise the references (there are too old references. .like 2003,2007...)	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language needs “language check” just apply spelling and grammar check and corrections	
Optional/General comments	The research idea is good but needs to be revised if possible by second look	

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mehretie Kokeb Alemu
Department, University & Country	University of Gondar, Ethiopia