



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_67218
Title of the Manuscript:	Risk of bleeding in patients with chronic kidney disease undergoing bronchoscopy
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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



[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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Presence of abbreviations in the abstract without the previous meaning. (TBLB, EBUS-TBNA, EBBX). 2. There is no description in absolute value or percentage of some categorical variables analyzed in the study, such as type of anesthesia and serum creatinine level. How many patients had creatinine greater than 2 or 3mg / dL? What percentage of patients used general anesthesia? 3. Table 3 does not show the "p" values for analyzing the variables. I suggest including other variables of interest in the study associated with bleeding. Example: comorbidity. The presentation of the results related to the main hypothesis of the work needs adjustment. 4. "...It is possible that increased bleeding rates were not related to general anesthesia but to the underlying comorbid conditions." The author addresses the possibility of confusion bias in the association of general anesthesia and bleeding. It is possible to test this hypothesis with the study data. I suggest comparing "underlying disease" x "bleeding", followed by the use of logistic regression. 5. The article is well written, mainly the introduction and the discussion, but it presents risk of confusion bias. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of standardization of references. Attention to items 8 and 9. 2. I believe that the sentence "Some researchers use categorical values to classify renal failure" should be in the methodology or discussion of the study, not in the results. 3. The unit of measurement of laboratory tests must be used after description of the value. Example: Cr: 3 mg / dL. See paragraph 2 of the discussion. 4. In table 1 referring to clinical demographic data, adjust the value referring to the item HIV Positive / CKD 5. 	
Optional/General comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jáder Pereira Almeida
Department, University & Country	Santa Casa de Belo Horizonte Hospital, Brazil