

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nephrology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRN_83182
Title of the Manuscript:	Acute Kidney Injury Due To Wild Mushroom Consumption: Hemodialysis And Ozonotherapy Combination A Therapeutic Asset (About One Case)
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:

(<https://www.journalajrn.com/index.php/AJRN/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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	<p>Abstract must be written in this form:</p> <p>Aims: is too long to assess the value of ozone therapy in the management of acute toxic kidney injury due to the ingestion of wild mushrooms.</p> <p>Even if severe intoxications by ingestion of wild mushrooms are rare, they can be fatal following the attacks of several organs with very serious complications. One of the complications is acute toxic kidney injury requiring emergency hemodialysis sessions.</p> <p>Presentation of Case : Author did not summarize it</p> <p>Discussion : Author did not summarize it</p> <p>Conclusion : is too long</p> <p>Extra renal purification can be effective if it is well conducted and associated with other treatments. This is the case of a multidisciplinary management of acute toxic renal failure by ingestion of wild mushroom whose management was done with hemodialysis associated with ozone therapy whose results were more interesting.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>Add “too” in sentence is not rare</p> <p>Presentation of Case</p> <p>Remove t in sentence thospital</p> <p>“WHO” abbreviation must be determined</p> <p>put results of paraclinical examination and their usual value in table in order to facilitate the comparision</p> <p>Table should be presented as per their appearance in the text</p> <p>author must correctly interpret the results</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>the discussion is not targeted because the author did not exploit the results well</p> <p>this raises several questions, for example :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What toxin type release after ingestion of toxic mushrooms ?• what is toxin's mechanism of action on kidney function ?• how ozonotherapy had improves kidney function, liver function ? <p>.....ect</p> <p>References</p> <p>bibliographic references are not written according to the standards of the journal</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Okay</p> <p>All the suggested correction have been done</p>
Minor REVISION comments		

Comment [UW1]: Remove t

Comment [UW2]: bibliographic references are not written according to the standards of the journal

Review Form 1.6

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)	