

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 66103

**Title:** Trends in Pediatric Nephrotic Syndrome

**Reviewer's code:** 05930630

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Reader (Associate Professor)

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-03-21

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-03-27 12:10

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-03-28 08:41

**Review time:** 20 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**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>

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

1. Present title does not reflect the manuscript hypothesis completely. this should be the precised one. Abstracted the main subject very well. Key words: does not reflected the main/ focused subject of manuscript. Background was described well but significance and present status was not described properly. still to focus on the main hypothesis. 2. Methods described in details. Results/ observation made by reviewing the subject will definitely helps in progress the research in the field. The manuscript interpret the findings/ reviews adequately and appropriately, focusing the key points clearly. the subject is discussed significance in relation to clinical practice. Tables illustrative of the paper contents appropriately. The manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized, but few of the grammatical mistakes are there. 3. The limitations of the study is not described. The future directions and the questions/issues that remain to be solved are not described. The publication impact the clinical practice in relation to therapeutic aspects of minimal change nephrotic syndrome. Research methods and reporting of the manuscript not completely followed the PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review.