SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_62262
Title of the Manuscript:	ACUTE RENAL PROBLEMS STILL A GREAT CHALLENGE IN OBSTETRICS
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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/journal/10/editorial-policy)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		This/fiel reedback fiele)
	In this article, the importance of a well-known subject is emphasized.	
	By which criteria a creatinine value of 1.2mg/dL was accepted as acute kidney injury. source must be indicated.(RIFLE,AKIN,KDIGO?)	
	Why creatinine level alone was used instead of parameters such as 24-hour urine collection, measurement of creatinine clearance or rate of increase of creatinine in defining acute kidney injury during pregnancy	
Minor REVISION comments	Many sentences are difficult to understand and their grammatical arrangement should be improved. Line 15: The sentence needs to be corrected. Line 28: Acute Kidney Injury (AKI), the abbreviation should be specified in parentheses. Line 35: PR-AKI; the abbreviation should be explained. Line 48: upto; the word must be written separately.	
Optional/General comments	I think it is a useful article for awareness raising. The article has been written with current literature.	

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

		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) Is it a retrospective study, or observational prospective? Was 5 ml extra blood taken from pregnant patients only for this study? Or record the results of tests that should be checked routinely? Have you done an extra test for this study that you don't routinely use? did this cause an ethical problem? Did the study have ethics committee approval?	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ayse Ayyildiz
Department, University & Country	Esksehir Osmangazi University, Turkey

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)