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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The main theme of this MS is not new issue. However, as the authors mentioned, the study was conducted on relatively large number of patients in an Eastern country. Thus, it is somewhat interesting article. I have several concerns which should be addressed adequately. 1. It is unclear what kind of points are novel. The authors should state novel aspects of this study clearly. 2. It is unclear whether the patients with genetic podocytopathy were excluded. Did the patients receive genetic testing? If not so, this issue should be clearly stated and discussed. Also, the limitation of the study regarding this issue should be added. 3. Was the treatment protocol in the study patients with the disease same? If not so, detailed treatment protocol in each patient should be represented.
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