Journal Name:	International Journal of Advances in Nephrology Research
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJANR_53510**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Sodium retention and intravascular volume status in childhood nephrotic syndrome**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty'**, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	(1a). Kindly note that "Tables and figures should be presented as per their appearance in the text. It is suggested that the discussion about the tables and figures should appear in the text before the appearance of the respective tables and figures", for (Tables 1 to 4) (1b). Please kindly move your Tables (1 to 4) into the text, and place same after the description of your Results and just above your Discussions. (2a). In your Reference, there are inconsistencies, especially in the year of publications of journals. Some journals appear with year of publications while some appear with month and year of publications. Kindly let the reference style be consistent, by allowing only the year of publications. (2b). Please note that the month of publications of your references should be excluded for this journals' style. (2c). Your referencing style should be in line with the authors' guidelines. "Eg, reference to a journal, for published paper: 1. Hilly M, Adams ML, Nelson SC. A study of digit fusion in the mouse embryo. Clin Exp Allergy. 2002;32(4):489-98". (Note that the month of publication was NOT included). (3). Please refer to the paper template or authors guidelines at www.sciencedomain.org/journal/23/ authors-instruction, for further clarifications.	(1a) Suggested amendment done. (1b) Suggested amendment done. (2a) Suggested amendment done. (2b) Suggested amendment done. (2c) Suggested amendment done. (3) Required action taken
Optional/General comments	Comments: Well articulated and written research article.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	No ethical issues in this article. It has been approved by the institute's ethical committee as mentioned in the text.