

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Nephrology*

Manuscript NO: 82642

Title: Acute renal failure with severe loin pain and patchy renal ischemia after anaerobic exercise

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05339586

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-26 06:05

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-06 15:08

Review time: 11 Days and 9 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" 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 rational of the study is sufficient and the purpose is clear. However, the organization of the manuscript is not usual. Most of current sections need rearrangement and moving some parts in between each other, as following: 1) Introduction and Background sections should be reconfigured by merging with reduction of the whole text of these sections or omitting the Background section and re-include its contents in the subsequent sections. Most of these information can be mentioned in the Discussion section. 2) Create and configure sections for Methods and Results of search of the review of literature. 3) Transfer the results data mentioned at the start of Discussion section to the configured Results section, including all the tables (by citing them in this text section). 4) There is a confusion in the results of the reviewed contents, where you referred to results of a specific study without defining this study. It is not clear whether these results are your own or from the literature. Revise the results mentioned with definition of each study mentioned by mentioning its authors or any other suitable ways. 5) Revise the following scientific information: -In Diagnostic criterion 4, you stated CT can be performed show scar wedges with serum ceatinine level 1.2 - 3.5mg/dL. Is it logic to



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgooffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

perform CT with contrast in those patients? -Define the anaerobic exercise at the Methods section. -Use of of the symbols (< and >) before the different numerical values mentioned in the results. -The source of data in the Tables is not defined. If they are from the literature, the reference should be cited in these tables. However, if these data from your own work. you should state this in the text and reconfigure this manuscript as an original research article. Please, clarify this issue. -The conclusion should include more information about the differences between the two types of ALPE. 6) Revise the manuscript for a few minor writing (typo) mishaps.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Nephrology*

Manuscript NO: 82642

Title: Acute renal failure with severe loin pain and patchy renal ischemia after anaerobic exercise

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06497638

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-30 12:52

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-02 08:09

Review time: 2 Days and 19 Hours

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] Grade A: Excellent [<input type="checkbox"/>] Grade B: Good [<input type="checkbox"/>] Grade C: Fair [<input type="checkbox"/>] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[<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
Conclusion	[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] Accept (High priority) [<input type="checkbox"/>] Accept (General priority) [<input 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

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? yes relevant

2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes its summaries all points

3 Key Words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes key words included

4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? yes its describe all relevant information related to background of hypothesis and results.

5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Yes all the Patients details in the study included

6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? Results are as per the hypothesis and contribution of other studies mentioned.

7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? discussion included two main type of acute kidney injury following exercise and muscle injury. 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams, and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative, with labeling of figures using arrows, asterisks, etc, and are the legends adequate and accurately reflective of the images/illustrations shown? yes all the relevant tables included with the patients data. 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Yes 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? yes Normal references value where needed should be included in the bracket 11 References. Does the manuscript appropriately cite the latest, important and authoritative references in the Introduction and Discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? Yes all relevant references included. 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Yes Manuscript is well written and Evidence for the Acute renal failure following exercise induced is rare but known condition and physician should be aware of this condition in clinical practice as it can me treated early followed by diagnosis and respond well to treatment, Hypo uricemia was also discussed as it is generally associated with it. Congratulations for excellent report on findings enumerated in tables. The Future of sports medicine should take into such cases and research should be initiated in the direction of prevention.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Nephrology*

Manuscript NO: 82642

Title: Acute renal failure with severe loin pain and patchy renal ischemia after anaerobic exercise

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05339586

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-25

Reviewer chosen by: Ji-Hong Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-24 18:42

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-25 19:13

Review time: 1 Day

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 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Despite the modifications performed by the author, there are major concerns still present in the Methods and Results (Tables mainly) sections; the author do not differentiate the review of the literature and the original research in the methods section (although the article is a review): 1) You should clearly report that this is a review article and all the cases are from the literature. also, Methods of a narrative or minireview should be defined considering the time frame. also, the comparisons should be reasoned why they are presented in this form!! 2) You should not compare some cases from the literature (as to be this study cases as shown in the tables) with other studies. This is the main cause of confusion to the reader. Hence, in the Methods (Item 2), you should revise this item and present the cases as reviewed cases not as this study cases (because it is a review and not an original research). 3) Many paragraphs in the Discussion section have no references!! each paragraph should be well-referenced (considering the style of journal is needed) 4) Revise for language; for example, In tables, the heading (This cases) is not correct.