PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Nephrology*

Manuscript NO: 68166

Title: Concordance between bio-impedance analysis and clinical score in fluid-status assessment of maintenance haemodialysis patients: A single centre experience

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03475636

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: FACP, MD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: Kenya

Manuscript submission date: 2021-06-19

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-07-10 21:45

Reviewer performed review: 2021-07-11 02:22

Review time: 4 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

| **Peer-reviewer statements** | Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous   [   ] Onymous |
| | Conflicts-of-Interest: [   ] Yes   [Y] No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Manuscript type called "Basic Study" but this is not basic study. Basic Study is basic research.   Prescription of dialysis needs to be additionally described. Baseline patients characteristics, e.g. LVEF, comorbidities, and dialysis characteristics, access should additionally be provided Missing data was not described, explored or accounted for. The statistical methods used were poorly described throughout.   The hypothesis of the study should be explicitly stated The authors should discuss what the clinical utility of these findings could be   There should be more discussion of a possible mechanism Explain what sort of future study might take us closer to a clinical utility

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[Y] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

All the commets have been addressed.