

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Cardiology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5484

Title: The Role of Nutrition and Nutraceuticals in the Treatment of Hypertension

Reviewer code: 02594129

Science editor: Wang, Jin-Lei

Date sent for review: 2013-09-12 16:52

Date reviewed: 2013-10-03 05:40

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is clear that author invested a lot of time in writing and preparing the review. However, the manuscript is still far from the condition which would make it "publishable". There is no point to go over small details of the paper, since it has major problems which should be addressed first before it could be reconsidered for publication in a peer reviewed medical journal. Abstract does not have conclusive statement for the paper. There are no supportive references to any of the statements presented in Introduction. Epidemiology section does not give clear explanation of the problem. Overall, the review is hard to read and understand: there are a lot of pertinent facts assembled together (in particular in Pathophysiology section) without proper logistic interconnections and completeness of the whole picture. Sections IV and V (Treatment and Clinical considerations) are very informative and interesting to read. Those two sections are the best parts of the article. However, they also need some further improvement to make them more concise and logistically interconnected. In general, the topic and the style it was presented would be very interesting not just to health professionals, but also to general public interested in the problem. If it was appropriately rewritten and prepared it would perfectly fit in a health care related journal for general public. Much more work should be completed to get it ready for the professional readers. It would look much better if focused on narrowed topic. Some minor remarks regarding the form: different fonts, size and styles should be unified according to the journal requirements.