|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Book Name: | [**Medical Science: Trends and Innovations**](https://www.bookpi.org/bookstore/product/medical-science-trends-and-innovations-vol-1/) |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms\_BPR\_4749** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **AN ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY OF LIFE IN ESRD PATIENTS UNDERGOING HEMODIALYSIS** |
| Type of the Article | **Book Chapter** |

**Special note:**

# A research paper already published in a journal can be published as a Book Chapter in an expanded form with proper copyright approval.

**Source Article:**

**This chapter is an extended version of the article published by the same author(s) in the following journal. The Egyptian Journal of Internal Medicine, 36, 104: 2024.**

**Available:** [**https://doi.org/10.1186/s43162-024-00370-0**](https://doi.org/10.1186/s43162-024-00370-0)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PART 1: Comments** | | |
|  | **Reviewer’s comment**  **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | **This manuscript explores an important topic in healthcare by assessing the quality of life (QOL) in end- stage renal disease (ESRD) patients undergoing hemodialysis. These patients often experience physical discomfort, emotional stress, and financial challenges. The study highlights key factors affecting their well-being, such as other health conditions, dialysis frequency, and personal circumstances.**  **By using the WHOQOL-BREF questionnaire, the research provides a reliable way to measure QOL in ESRD patients. The findings can help doctors, researchers, and policymakers develop better treatment plans and support systems to improve patient care and overall well-being.** |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **Yes, the title of the article is appropriate and accurately reflects the study's primary objective. It is concise and clearly conveys the focus on QOL evaluation in ESRD patients undergoing hemodialysis.** |  |
| **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 provides a clear overview of the study, including the background, aim, methods, results, and conclusion.** |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | **The manuscript appears to be scientifically accurate and methodologically correct. The use of the WHOQOL-BREF questionnaire, a validated tool, ensures that the QOL assessment is reliable and standardized. The study design is appropriate for the research objectives, and the statistical analyses are**  **used effectively to interpret the data.** |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.**  **-** | **The references cited in the manuscript are adequate and relevant to the study's focus on QOL in ESRD patients. However, some references appear outdated (№9, №10) or could be supplemented with more recent studies.** |  |
| **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?** | **The language is generally clear and suitable for scholarly communication. However, there are some mistakes**  **Suggestions:**  **"being treated on OUT patient basis" should be corrected to "being treated on an outpatient basis"). Scattered diagram oft he relationship - Scattered diagram of the relationship**  **POR (fig 1) - POOR** |  |
| **Optional/General** comments | **The manuscript presents a valuable study on the QOL of ESRD patients undergoing hemodialysis. With improvements in language, reference updating, it has the potential to make a significant contribution to the field.**  **The «discussion» could be more structured, summarizing key findings, comparing them with existing research, and providing actionable recommendations for clinical practice.** |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PART 2:** | | |
|  | **Reviewer’s comment** | **Author’s comment** *(if agreed with the 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 detail)* |  |

**Reviewers:**

Serhii Hryshchuk, Zhytomyr Medical Institute, Ukraine