

**REVIEW FORM**

<b>Manuscript No:</b>	<b>Reviewer No:</b>	<b>Date:</b>
<b>Manuscript Title:</b>		

**Thank you for serving as a reviewer for the Ukrainian Journal of Nephrology and Dialysis.**

Please provide comments to the editor (which will not be forwarded to the authors) and detailed comments/recommendations to the author(s). Due to editorial philosophy and the current position of the journal please provide critical but constructive suggestions on how the weaknesses of a manuscript can be minimized. The comments should contain the recommendation for acceptance/rejection of a manuscript.

Due to our choice of knowledgeable reviewers and our aim of timely/effective peer review process please prepare the review within two weeks and send it per e-mail at ukrjnd@yandex.ua. For the review please use the language according to those of the manuscript (Ukrainian, Russian or English).

**Evaluation to the editor**

(please mark the respective boxes)

Criteria	Evaluation				
	acceptable			currently not acceptable	
	very good	good	small weaknesses	great weaknesses	absolutely insufficient
<b><i>Title Page &amp; Abstract</i></b>					
1. Are the manuscript's title, author's name(s), institution and keywords available in English and in the original language on the title page?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Is the abstract structured and contains over 1800 characters?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b><i>Introduction</i></b>					
3. Does the introduction provide sufficient background information for readers not in the immediate field to understand the problem/hypotheses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Are the reasons for performing the study clearly defined?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Are the study objectives clearly defined?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Criteria	Evaluation				
	acceptable			currently not acceptable	
	very good	good	small weaknesses	great weaknesses	absolutely insufficient
<b>Material &amp; Methods</b>					
6. Is sufficient information provided for a capable researcher to reproduce the experiments described?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Are the following points outlined in the section: the design of the study, criterias of inclusion and exclusion, primary and secondary end points, statistical methods?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Is the statement related to ethical clearance of the study included?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Are appropriate references cited where previously established methods are used?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Results/statistics</b>					
10. Are the results clearly explained and presented in an appropriate format?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Do the figures and tables show essential data or are there any that could easily be summarized in the text?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Are the figures and tables easy to interpret?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Are there any additional graphics that would add clarity to the text?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Have appropriate statistical methods been used to test the significance of the results?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Discussion</b>					
15. Are all possible interpretations of the data considered or are there alternative hypotheses that are consistent with the available data?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Are the findings properly described in the context of the published literature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. Are the limitations of the study discussed? If not, what are the major limitations that should be discussed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*Ukrainian Journal of Nephrology and Dialysis*

Criteria	Evaluation				
	acceptable			currently not acceptable	
	very good	good	small weaknesses	great weaknesses	absolutely insufficient
<b>Conclusions</b>					
18. Are the conclusions of the study supported by appropriate evidence or are the claims exaggerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Literature cited (introduction, results, discussion)</b>					
19. References prepared according to the requirements of the Journal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. Is the literature cited balanced or are there important studies not cited, or other studies disproportionately cited?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Significance and Novelty</b>					
21. Are the claims in the paper sufficiently novel to warrant publication?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22. Does the study represent a conceptual advance over previously published work?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>Overall evaluation</b> (please mark the respective box)				
<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
acceptable for publication without changes	acceptable for publications after minor revisions	acceptable for publication after major revisions	not acceptable for publication, but author(s) should be encouraged to resubmit	reject

**Comments to the editor**

**Detailed comments/recommendations to the author(s)**

(please use numbers for each comment due to an easier response on issues done.)

**Strengths of the manuscript.**

**Major concerns and improvement suggestions.**

- 1.
- 2.

**Minor concern and improvement suggestions.**

- 1.
- 2.