



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_47438
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating Serum Urea, Creatinine and Hemoglobin Level in Chronic Renal Failure of Pre and Post Dialysis at St. Paul's Hospital Millennium Medical College, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
Type of the 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	<p>1-The article does not contribute to the health area because its objectives are well described in the literature (urea and creatinine were known as toxic substance there level elevated before dialysis and reduced after dialysis).</p> <p>2- The basis for poor scoring was the poor present, both in grammar and scientific writing throughout the manuscript.</p> <p>3-Author mistakes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a- State how sample size was determined in this study (the sample size 33 was too short and not representative to the CKD population—>prevalence rate of CKD in Ethiopia?) b- The study does not proof the differences between per and post dialysis group because the t-test not applied and p-value not calculated. c- Why you exclude HIV and hepatitis patients while your tested parameters not immunologically affected. d- Why you analysing urea level for only 26 patients and on what basis you excluding 7? e- Why you writing literature review in the result chapter (evaluation of creatinine/Hb) 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohamed Siddig Mohamed Ahmed Mulah
Department, University & Country	University of Alabama, Libya