

Review of: "Audit of Dialysis Vascular Access in a Sub-Saharan Tertiary Hospital"

Bashir Bashir

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear/ editor

I thoroughly read that research. I also read the author's response and the reviewer's remarks. The sole flaw in the research report is that it is an observational retrospective study with a limited number of patients. Nonetheless, it provides us with guidelines and scope for a portion of healthcare services in low-income communities. It demonstrated to us how doctors can handle other treatments if AVF is not possible. It demonstrated to us a comparison between femoral and other access as a straightforward hemolysis route. Lastly, it is advised that AVF be taken into consideration, and the establishment of a precise blueprint. I therefore embrace that research because it is reputable and well-made. I agree for the research to be published following a small revision.

The following contains some feedback on your effort.

Abstract

- Materials and methods: 1. The time of the study is not mentioned. 2. The method used to collect the data should also appear here.
- · Objective: It is clear.
- Results: Males were more prevalent than (females).
- Conclusion: Good.

Introduction

- 1. Needs some of the prevalence of each type of vascular access. You can find it in the medical literature.
- 2. Otherwise, it is well-written.

Materials and Methods

- 1. The author needs to explain his area clearly (state, town, country, and the service community of the center).
- 2. Defines the types of underlying diseases that lead to hemodialysis.

Data Analysis

- 1. Mention the types of variables used and describe the statistical tests employed to analyze these parameters.
- 2. Explain if your data is normally distributed or not.



- 3. Mention the value that is accordingly used to classify the data significantly.
- 4. On this account, the data analysis of this study has not consisted.

Results

Figures 1, 2, and 3 are not mentioned in the text results chapter.

Discussion

- 1. This chapter is well-written and stated.
- 2. At the end of this chapter, the author needs to explain what the limitations of this study are.

Conclusion

Well-stated.

References

The author used updated citations.