

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_76503
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE ON HEMODIALYSIS AMONG RENAL PATIENTS
Type of the 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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>First, I would like to thank you for the invitation to review the article entitled "ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE ON HEMODIALYSIS AMONG RENAL PATIENTS".</p> <p>I'll start making some corrections,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the abstract in the second line the word hemodialysis is misspelled. 2. In the introduction in the third line where it startsThere are two different types of dialysis hemodialysis and peritoneal dialysis [1]. Please correct are two types of treatment.... And I think I could talk a little bit about each type of therapy. 3. The second paragraph of the Introduction is very confusing, I believe it has to better explain the types of access for hemodialysis. 4. Still in the introduction in the paragraph that says: . "It is one of the most serious issues facing health-care organizations, and it has the potential to result in global death. Chronic renal failure can occur at any age, and according to the 2006 report...", I believe there are more recent articles to add this information. 5. In the study methodology, in the end only women were chosen to participate in the questionnaires, if so why? 6. In table 2, I divide by level of knowledge, % and no? 7. I didn't find in the text where it talks in more detail about what was asked in the questionnaire and its results, it only reports the understanding of the nutritional part of the patient in the conclusion, it would be interesting more information about it. 	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marcela Lara Mendes
Department, University & Country	Universidade Estadual Paulista Júlio de Mesquita Filho (UNESP), Brazil