

Review Form 2

Book Name:	Disease and Health Research: New Insights
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3164
Title of the Manuscript:	MPO ANCA Positivity in IgA Nephropathy: Imposter or Implication?
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The information it contains may be of interest especially to healthcare professionals who come into contact with this rare case. I have seen several similar clinical cases in the past, however, each of them, like this one, was worthy of attention. I have no objections to the factual content; however, I would add a few items such as: 1. has the patient ever had positive anti-GBM antibodies? pANCA? 2. it would be worth noting the possible dynamics of changes in antibody values, especially as they have become more important in patient monitoring in the current KDIGO 2024 guidelines. 3 In this context, it is also necessary to complete the data on changes in urine sediment, also with regard to possible dynamics. Was residual diuresis maintained?	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of the article is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsection 2.2 (Clinical Findings) does not have enough information. Add to another sub-section / extend the existing one.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The work as a whole coincides with current knowledge and can serve to help future clinicians who will have to face this type of patient. A great addition, which other clinical cases often do not include, is the presence of microscopic findings with an explanation of what is seen and where, together with photographs included in the work.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	All the references are sufficient and recent.	

Review Form 2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	As much as I look forward to and am absolutely in favour of using artificial intelligence to help write and produce scientific papers, sending a scientific paper written by AI without first checking the language is unacceptable to me. There are a mass of errors in the work, both linguistic, grammatical and syntactical. Many of the elements can be completely incomprehensible to non-healthcare professionals, which defeats the purpose of the holistic approach of scientific papers. Please read your paper once AGAIN and fully correct all the errors- with particular attention to subsection 2.2, which looks like a conglomeration of random words and elements; subsection 3.2; subsection 3.3; subsection 2.1; and the entire section 4 (discussion).	
Optional/General comments		

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jakub Janczura
Department, University & Country	Jan Kochanowski University of Kielce, Poland