

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Nephrology*

Manuscript NO: 87088

Title: Seeing through the myths: Practical aspects of diagnostic point-of-care ultrasound in nephrology

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04551037

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, MSc

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2023-07-23

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-09-19 08:28

Reviewer performed review: 2023-09-20 12:04

Review time: 1 Day and 3 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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The general structure of the article is quite interesting and detailed. Detailing the subject by giving titles based on myths has created an interesting style. I have some suggestions to make the article more organized: Ultrasound images of case examples that make each myth visually understandable should be added. In which cases the case should be referred to the radiology department can be given in detail.