



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Data presented are too scanty –only % causes of kidney disease and age group 2. No data on the indicators used as basis for classifying the causes of kidney diseases 3. The author(s) claimed to have used SPSS (version 19) for data analysis, but no such analysis in the whole paper 4. The age groups should be presented as mean $\pm$SD	Noted. It was a retrospective study. Renal diagnosis were extracted from case notes of patients. For instance the diagnosis of obstructive uropathy was made by the urologist after full investigations. We used the final diagnosis made in case notes of patients. SPSS was used to analyse some aspect of the data.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Check the manuscript for suggested title and some other comments 2. New teaching hospital in the keywords should be replaced by appropriate word and if possible add another one 3. Figure 1 and Table 2 contain the same information-delete one 4. Indicate whether the values in Figure 2 are in %	Noted. All the comments were noted and all the corrections have been made in the revised manuscript. Thank you so much.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript need to be improved as data presented are too scanty. The author(s) should also provide data on number of cases per year for the period under review as this will help to know the trend of the disease.	Many corrections have been made in the revised manuscript. Thank you so much for your time and comments.