

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

Manuscript NO: 35013

Title: Atypical hemolytic-uremic syndrome due to complement factor I mutation

Reviewer's code: 00503255

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2017-08-10

Date reviewed: 2017-08-13

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors described a patient with atypical hemolytic uremic syndrome (aHUS) due to heterozygous CFI mutation, who was successfully treated with eculizumab and could stop the therapy. The paper is well-written and has interesting findings. 1. Some studies reported clinical outcome of aHUS with discontinuation of eculizumab. The authors should discuss this point with literature review.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

Manuscript NO: 35013

Title: Atypical hemolytic-uremic syndrome due to complement factor I mutation

Reviewer's code: 00503014

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2017-08-07

Date reviewed: 2017-08-16

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In general, the draft is an important issue and had been well-written. Only small comments for the authors: 1. For easy reading, the author could re-write the timeline to figure and including the renal function change.