

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Nephrology</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRN_84944</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Sex Dependent differences of the glomerulus and interstitium in 2K1C rats.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

### **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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>The submitted manuscript is not a review article as stated on top</p> <p>The Title is not informative and should be reworded to encompass the aim of the study</p> <p>In the Abstract "RAS" should be changed to "RAAS"</p> <p>The sentence "Thirty-two animal rats participated in the study" needs rewording since the word "animals" is redundant and animals to do "participate"</p> <p>The authors need to decide whether to use "renin-angiotensin system (RAS)" or "renin-angiotensin-aldosterone system (RAAS)" and be consistent throughout the manuscript</p> <p>The Methods section is missing any mention of ethics approval, and the procedure of the operations</p> <p>The company and catalogue number of the primary antibody against proliferating cell nuclear antigen (PCNA) needs to be included</p> <p>The Discussion is devoid of any possible mechanisms for the results obtained. The only reasons provided are limitations in the selection of the animals and this does not provide any useful basis for further experiments.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Byron Baron
Department, University & Country	University of Malta, Malta