



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGMB_42612
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF SALIVA FOR MONITORING RENAL FUNCTION IN HAEMODIALYSIS PATIENTS AT UNIVERSITY OF PORT HARCOURT TEACHING HOSPITAL
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> References order needs serious attention. From the introduction section, first reference is number 8. Most references cited in reference section do not appear in the text at all! Authors should use terms like "kidney disease" instead of "kidney failure" and "chronic kidney disease" instead of old term "chronic renal failure" There are quite a number of previous studies that have already shown the diagnostic accuracy of saliva for diagnosing kidney disease. Authors should justify in the introduction section why they think this study was necessary? Methods section is very scanty! (a) Describe how randomization was done for cases (b) Description of source of control and how they were recruited is missing (c) Include study area and when was the study done (d) Include inclusion and exclusion criteria for cases Results section: Age of case and control differs significantly meaning that there was no matching between cases and control. This brings about selection bias factor It is better to separate results and discussion section. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The focus of this study is to determine if salivary urea allows for changes in concentration after therapeutic administration In the inclusion criteria that will be included in the revised work, the subjects that were recruited for the study were between the ages of 18 to 60 for both control and haemodialyzed patients. Although the mean age of both groups differs, they were both within the age limit stated for this study.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		