

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS manuscript NO: 11943

Title: Clinical audit, a valuable tool to improve quality of care: general methodology and applications in Nephrology.

Reviewer code: 00503199

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-06-16 08:08

Date reviewed: 2014-07-19 02:23

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existing	<input 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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a nice review suitable for publication. However the authors could propose potential audit themes that now lack in the Nephrology Field

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS manuscript NO: 11943

Title: Clinical audit, a valuable tool to improve quality of care: general methodology and applications in Nephrology.

Reviewer code: 00503255

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-06-16 08:08

Date reviewed: 2014-07-24 11:07

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existing	<input 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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

No major point should be revised in this paper. Minor points 1. page 10, line 3: "Chrocane Study Group" should be changed to "Cochrane Study Group" 2. What problems other than vascular access, hypertension management or anemia in nephrology should be involved in clinical audit projects in future?