PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology
Manuscript NO: 35896
Title: Awareness, self-management behaviors, health literacy, and kidney function relationships in specialty practice
Reviewer's code: 00503228
Reviewer's country: Iran
Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong
Date sent for review: 2017-09-04
Date reviewed: 2017-09-12
Review time: 8 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for
[Y] Grade C: Good	polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	publication
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade E: Poor	language polishing	[Y] No	[ ] Minor revision
	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	[Y] Major revision
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

- Results "16 patients who agreed to participate but failed to meet screening criteria. "you'd better give detailed data how many patients were excluded due to which of the exclusion criteria. -   Methods: Had any of you patients been under dialysis before; on what schedule? how long? until when? - I recommed to stratify your patients into diabetics and non-diabetics, and reanalyse you data comparing patients of the two groups. You know; diabetes in the single most prevalent and with most singular features in CKD. - How many of your patients had comorbidity; and how it affects your study results. I recommend a more emphasizing on most important comorbidities (CVA, cardiac, etc.) - Result: You just say multivariable analyses were not significant. It is not the right way to present your data. You should firstly give uni- and bi-variate analyses in tables and give RR/OR(95%CI), and then you conduct your multivariable analysis

one by one starting by the most important ones, in a step-wise manner; and see how the significance levels change. In a study of limited sample size like your with such a large number of variables, it is not surprising that multi-variable analysis in a pooled way returns non-significance. - Methods: I know you gave a reference to your method, but it still needs some expansion. It is too much concise. For example the formula you calculated the GFR and so.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology
Manuscript NO: 35896
Title: Awareness, self-management behaviors, health literacy, and kidney function relationships in specialty practice
Reviewer's code: 02888410
Reviewer's country: Spain
Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong
Date sent for review: 2017-09-04
Date reviewed: 2017-09-14
Review time: 10 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C: Good		[ ] Duplicate publication	
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[Y] Minor revision
	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	[ ] Major revision
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript offers interesting results but it needs some minor corrections. What formula was used to estimated GFR: MDRD-4 or MDRD-4-IDMS? Frecuency data are transcripted without statistical significance. It must be fulfilled and the comments corrected as needed. A no awarenes proportion of 40% is to high to say: "... awareness of having CKD was high among patients in this outpatient nephrology specialty clinic". This should be modified in Summary, Discussion and Conclusions. In fact the most interesting results is the need to improve patients information in stages I and II. Discussion is too long and should be shortened. The last but one paragraph could be erased.