

February 18,

Dear Dr. Li Zuo,, Editor-In-Chief, *World Journal of Nephrology*

We thank referees for careful reading our manuscript and for giving useful comments. We have revised the manuscript We have revised the manuscript NO 8462, entitled " Nephrotic Syndrome in children." on the basis of Referee's comments.

We have made major revisions according to the reviewer's pointed out and it is in English proofreading. Revisions in the text are shown using red highlight for additions and changes, and strikethrough font for deletions.

We look forward to a publication of our manuscript in *World Journal of Nephrology*.

Sincerely,

Hiroshi Tamura MD, PhD

Department of Pediatrics, Faculty of Life Sciences, Kumamoto University,

Kumamoto 1-1-1 Honjo, Kumamoto 860, Japan

E-mail: bohm1905HT@kuh.kumamoto-u.ac.jp

FAX: JPN 096-373-5191

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade A (Excellent)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (High priority)

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 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 be 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.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

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.

Response: It was fixed in accordance with you pointed out. (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.

Response: It was fixed in accordance with you pointed out. (Create and configure sections for Methods and Results)

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).

Response: It was fixed in accordance with you pointed out.

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.

Response: It was fixed in accordance with you pointed out.

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 perform CT with contrast in those patients? -

Response: Thank you for your advice, this time it is a quote from Diagnostic criteria [reference No.34].

Define the anaerobic exercise at the Methods section. -

Use of of the symbols (< and >) before the different numerical values mentioned in the results. -

Response: It was fixed in accordance with you pointed out.

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. –

Response: It was fixed in accordance with you pointed out. (Methods)

The conclusion should include more information about the differences between the two types of ALPE.

Thank you for your advice, this time, we think the importance of this paper is that ‘the development of ALPE is a result of the cumulative effects of risk factors such as exercise, hypouricemia, NSAIDs, vasopressors, and dehydration’.

5) Revise the manuscript for a few minor writing (typo) mishaps.

Response: The manuscript has been carefully reviewed by an experienced editor whose first language is English.

6 EDITORIAL OFFICE’S COMMENTS

Authors must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office’s comments and suggestions, which are listed below:

(1) Science editor:

The manuscript has been peer-reviewed, and it's ready for the first decision.

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

(2) Company editor-in-chief:

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Nephrology, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Authors are required to provide standard three-line tables, that is, only the top line, bottom line, and column line are displayed, while other table lines are hidden. The contents of each cell in the table should conform to the editing specifications, and the lines of each row or column of the table should be aligned. Do not use carriage returns or spaces to replace lines or vertical lines and do not segment cell content. Before final acceptance, when revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the RCA. RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision. Please visit our RCA database for more information at: <https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/>.