

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Nephrology*

**Manuscript NO:** 73887

**Title:** Renal Biopsies in Nephritic Syndrome: Update

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03455028

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** Iran

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-12-07

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-12-08 02:51

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-12-16 14:53

**Review time:** 8 Days and 12 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Agree to published.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Nephrology*

**Manuscript NO:** 73887

**Title:** Renal Biopsies in Nephritic Syndrome: Update

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 00503194

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Consultant Physician-Scientist

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Greece

**Author's Country/Territory:** Iran

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-12-07

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-01-04 05:12

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-01-10 18:49

**Review time:** 6 Days and 13 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

REVIEW FOR WORLD JOURNAL OF NEPHROLOGY Manuscript No 73887

Manuscript Type: Meta- Analysis Title: Renal Biopsies in Nephritic Syndrome:

Update Summary and overall Evaluation- General Points This article states that it is a

meta- analysis of renal biopsies in nephritic syndrome. The major problem of the article

is the lack of clarity The reader can not follow the PRISMA 2009 checklist, although

provided by the authors The language is poor both for syntax and grammar Otherwise

the number of reports is impressive and the workload by the authors should not be

wasted. Specific comments and Improvement points 1) What is the population

investigated? In which parts of the world? Should be stated in the Abstract. Later in the

text the contribution of each continent should specified with the most prevalent

diagnosis. 2) In Results: "NiS was the indication for renal biopsies in 21% of the total

populations worldwide": Both grammar error and lack of meaning. What total

population? Later in "Definitions and event classifications" the authors state diagnosis of

Membranous Nephropathy, Focal and Segmental Glomerulonephritis, Amyloidosis, i.e.

histopathology patterns that relate to nephrotic , not nephritic syndrome In "Searching

and selecting reports for review" the authors state that they searched 162 reports "whose

indication for renal biopsies was nephritic syndrome". So, what are actually the data

included? Nephritic Syndrome with and without nephrotic syndrome? In cases of

nephrotic syndrome was an Acute Renal Injury (ARI) misdiagnosed as nephritic

syndrome? For example: In table 2 we see "MCD= minimal change disease" as a

potential diagnosis of nephritic syndrome. This can not be. MCD can present clinically

with deterioration of renal function but histologically an acute tubular injury is

diagnosed plus the podocytopathy. The authors must change the title in acute renal



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

injury in renal biopsies with proteinuria and or hematuria.Or be more specific in what they state. Recommendation Accepted after major revision