

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_83280
Title of the Manuscript:	The Gender Associations of Neutrophil Lymphocyte Ratio in Acute Kidney Injury and Chronic Kidney Disease.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The authors are talking about NLR. Everywhere there is the mention inflammation markers, but inside , there are no results of inflammation markers. We propose that they should not talk about it like it was done.</p> <p>The conclusion should be revised.</p> <p>The reference of the UACR should be revised , we think that KDIGO threshold should be used ; they should not insit on the urinary strip</p> <p>We do not understand the place of the PLR in the study. Are they studying two ratio?</p>	<p>Relationship between the NLR and inflammatory markers likes hyperuricemia and urine albumin creatinine ratio (UACR) were determined.</p> <p>The conclusion has been revised.</p> <p>The reference of the UACR has been revised and replaced by that by KDIGO The PLR has been watered down.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Some biochemical parameters in the results are not in the method section In table 1, the number of males and females are not the one put , there are more than 44 females</p> <p>There are a lot of words missing in some sentences</p>	<p>The lipid panel has been included in the methods part of the manuscript.in this revision. The number of males and females have been reviewed in this revision.</p> <p>The grammatical errors have been corrected.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>The English should be improved, the sections are not well separated.</p>	<p>There is an improvement in the grammatical presentation of the manuscript.</p>

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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>	No ethical issues. Ethical approval was received for this study.