

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Advances in Nephrology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJANR_111208
Title of the Manuscript:	Study of the spectrum of pathological findings in renal transplant recipients with an asymptomatic slow rise in serum creatinine at a tertiary care centre in North India.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Mentioned in the note</p> <p>PI ref the note</p> <p>More or less</p> <p>Should we consider Background and intro separate?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Nil</p> <p>PI see the note</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Need correction</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Abstract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The abstract is a concise summary but could provide more precise data. For instance, mention the specific number or percentage of participants with each type of pathological finding if that is a key aspect of the results. <p>Background</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The background could start with a stronger hook, better emphasizing the significance of the problem the study addresses. <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Should we consider Background and introduction separately?The introduction successfully defines 'creeping creatinine' but could contextualize the problem within the broader landscape of kidney transplantation outcomes.It can be improved by clearly defining 'creeping creatinine' and explaining its clinical significance. Adding recent statistics or studies that highlight the relevance of the issue can	

	<div><div>bolster the background's persuasiveness .</div><div><ul style="list-style-type: none">It could benefit from summarizing existing literature, current gaps in knowledge, and the specific contribution this study aims to make.</div></div> <div><div>Aim and objective</div><div><ul style="list-style-type: none">The aim could be more succinctly stated. For instance: "This study assesses the range of pathological findings associated with asymptomatic, slow increases in serum creatinine among renal transplant recipients."</div></div> <div><div>Methodology</div><div><ul style="list-style-type: none">Clarify the time period after transplantation that defines a "slow creeping rise" in creatinine.Mention if there was a method for determining which participants would receive biopsies, or if all participants during that time period were included.Consider adding the total number of transplant recipients reviewed during the study period to provide context for the 30 patients included. Methods of patient recruitment and follow-up procedures should also be detailed.</div></div> <div><div>Results</div><div><ul style="list-style-type: none">The results mention several significant findings but would benefit from stating explicitly what those findings are (using numbers and percentages is good, but should be detailed directly in the text too).The sentence structures in the results could be more varied for an easier read.. It's essential to link these results back to the study's objectives and provide context for their clinical significance.</div></div> <div><div>Discussion</div><div><ul style="list-style-type: none">The discussion provides a comprehensive overview but should more directly link the study's findings to existing literature and clinical practice.Mention any limitations of the study; discuss any potential confounding factors that have been controlled for or acknowledge those that haven't.</div></div> <div><div>Conclusion</div><div><ul style="list-style-type: none">Reinforce the practical implications of your findings and suggest any potential changes to clinical practice or policy that your research supports.</div></div>	
--	--	--

Review Form 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•• For improvement, consider suggesting specific actions that the findings indicate and mention future research directions <p>General Suggestions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ensure consistency in terminology (e.g., use either 'renal transplant recipients' or 'kidney transplant recipients' throughout).• Improve transitions between sections so that the paper has a coherent narrative flow.	
--	--	--

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vijayakumar K
Department, University & Country	India