

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Advances in Nephrology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJANR_126117
Title of the Manuscript:	Usefulness of biochemical markers in monitoring renal function in chronic kidney disease
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript will be helpful in making the scientific community understand about the importance of biochemical markers in assessment of renal function. The study lacks originality but it is technically sound.	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	Thanks
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes, the abstract is comprehensive. I would suggest these two points. 1. In the conclusion part of the abstract, the authors mention that the study investigates the usefulness of these indicators in evaluating the feasibility of therapeutic interventions. But no where in the study the authors talk about feasibility of therapeutic interventions. Kindly correct. 2. Kindly write Aim as the subheading and not Aims.	Revision included
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study while technically sound does lack in terms of being scientifically robust as it presents scientific information already known and researched and does not add new information or knowledge.	Done revision
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	While the references are sufficient, almost 50 percent of the references are more than 5 years old. It is suggested that the authors add more references that are published within the last 5 years.	Corrected
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The authors need to make a few corrections in terms of the tense and syntax. I will quote a few examples here: 1. Chronic kidney disease (CKD) involves a progressive loss of kidney function, resulting in metabolic waste [1], resulting in physical disabilities and increasing the risk of cardiovascular other issues and complications are likely to occur [2] 2. Patients should be asked about any medications they are currently taking, as certain medications (eg, diuretics and ACE inhibitors) may affect the results of kidney function tests [14]. Depending on which test or test is being performed, medications time may have to be considered or controlled [15].	Revised
Optional/General comments	In the sentence "As expected, baseline levels of blood urea nitrogen (BUN), serum creatinine, and estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) deteriorated with progression of CKD group 1 (CKD stage 1-2), showed a slight increase in normal mental function..." Is it mental function or renal function, kindly clarify	ok

Review Form 3

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>	