



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_31742
Title of the Manuscript:	SPECTRUM OF RENAL DISEASES IN A NEW TEACHING HOSPITAL IN MAKURDI, NIGERIA.
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>)



SDI 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	Corrections required as per table Attached at end	Noted. Corrections effected in the revised manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments	A small flow chart will add to the strength of the article.	Noted. The annual distribution of patients during the period under review has been included in the revised manuscript.
Optional/General comments	Hope the data is not fabricated and should add to actual insight into issues related to kidney problems. Is there any relation to....Francois Folefack Kaze,^{1,&} Forbin Elias Ekokobe,¹ Marie Patrice Halle,² Hermine Fouda,³ Alain Patrick Menanga,¹ and Gloria Ashuntantang. The clinical pattern of renal diseases in the nephrology in-patient unit of the Yaounde General Hospital in Cameroon: a five-year audit. Pan Afr Med J. 2015; 21: 205. Published online 2015 Jul 20. doi: 10.11604/pamj.2015.21.205.5945 PMCID: PMC4575702 EXPLAIN	The patients used for the study were patients i personally managed or co-managed with the surgeons or gynaecologists at BSUTH, Makurdi. There is no relation with the article. I embarked on a wide literature search in the course of this study and i cited the reference of the work i came across. This happen to be one of them. The Setting, aims and objectives are different. The approach is also entirely different. The definitions i used are all standard definitions which can be gotten from any standard nephrology textbook. The other corrections have all been effected in the revised manuscript. Thank you so much for your time and your very valuable comments. I deeply appreciate.

Comments JAMPS-31742

S. No.	Page No./ Line No.	Correction/replacement	Change Required
1.	1/13	retrospective study of patients	Retrospective analysis of



SDI Review Form 1.6

		admitted for renal diseases in 3 years	patients admitted in medicine????? From this year..... to
1.	2/52	AKL	AKI
2.	3/66	the burden chronic	the burden of chronic
3.	4/109-110	(frequency, proportions, means and standard deviation)	(frequency, proportions, means and standard deviation)
		The level of significance was set at 5%).	The level of significance was set at 5%.
4.	5/112	Flow chart showing this data	Total patients, renal patients, included, excluded, outcome.....
5.	8/201	my	this
6.	10/232-234	We excluded some 232 patients due to 233 incomplete files and also most patients are self-funded such that only 234 patients who could pay for their care were admitted into the hospital thus 235 constituting a selection bias.	Some patients were excluded because of incomplete files. There could have been selection bias as most patients were self-funded and only patients who could pay for their care were admitted into the hospital.