

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nephrology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRN_78047
Title of the Manuscript:	A Case Report on Fish Bile Toxicity- a rare cause of Multiple Organ Dysfunction Syndrome
Type of the Article	Case study

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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>here is my review. i suggest MINOR REVISIONS. sincerely, frieder keller</p> <p>Ms_AJRN_78047 The English needs improvement The name of the patient should be anonymized CASE, paragraph 1: Specify what "other medications" mean Table 1: write WBC 12 000 not 12000 and platelets 245 000 not 245000 What was the kidney size in ultrasound ... large or small ... Figure 2 is not needed. Tubular necrosis is what we want to know as shown in figure 1 Please give a reason or an explanation why peritoneal dialysis did not well but hemodialysis saved the patient's life References 11 and 12 look incomplete</p>	<p>Thank you so much for your kind review.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. I made some changes to improve English.2. Patient's name withdrawn.3. Case, Paragraph 1 : Other medications now specified.4. Table 1 correction done.5. Figure 2 excluded from the manuscript.6. Kidney Size now mentioned.7. All other case reports I studied, all modalities of dialysis were used but if patient remained hemodynamically stable they did hemodialysis and got rapid response. As my patient already got peritoneal dialysis for 24hours in another hospital without any improvement, that's why we started hemodialysis without any delay.8. References 11 and 12 now completed.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 1.6

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)	