

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

Manuscript NO: 88028

Title: Clinicopathological features and medium-term outcomes of histologic variants of

primary focal segmental glomerulosclerosis in adults: A retrospective study

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00503257

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: Pakistan

Manuscript submission date: 2023-09-06

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-02 01:41

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-09 02:10

Review time: 7 Days

	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	 [] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] 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

The main theme of this MS is not new issue. However, as the authors mentioned, the study was conducted on relatively large number of patients in an Eastern country. Thus, it is somewhat interesting article. I have several concerns which should be addressed adequately. 1. It is unclear what kind of points are novel. The authors should state novel aspects of this study clearly. 2. It is unclear whether the patients with genetic podocytopathy were excluded. Did the patients receive genetic testing? If not so, this issue should be clearly stated and discussed. Also, the limitation of the study regarding this issue should be added. 3. Was the treatment protocol in the study patients with the disease same? If not so, detailed treatment protocol in each patient should be represented.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology Manuscript NO: 88028 Title: Clinicopathological features and medium-term outcomes of histologic variants of primary focal segmental glomerulosclerosis in adults: A retrospective study Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed Peer-review model: Single blind **Reviewer's code:** 00503257 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: MD, PhD **Professional title:** Professor Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan Author's Country/Territory: Pakistan Manuscript submission date: 2023-09-06 Reviewer chosen by: Xin-Liang Qu Reviewer accepted review: 2023-12-01 12:23 Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-01 12:30 Review time: 1 Hour

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 [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection 	
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [Y] 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

I understand the authors' responses. The revised MS would be OK.