ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript by Belhareth and Kege describes origin of macrophages and concerning of pathophysiology of human disease such as atherosclerosis, cancer, infectious diseases, neurodegenerative diseases. This manuscript has been given a high enough priority for publication

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Immunology
ESPS manuscript NO: 21402
Title: Macrophage populations and self-renewal: Changing the paradigm
Reviewer's code: 00502947
Reviewer's country: Australia
Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji
Date sent for review: 2015-07-14 12:05
Date reviewed: 2015-07-26 13:11

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an important area of research which will lead to significant changes in our concepts on macrophages and their role in chronic inflammatory disease. So the review is welcomed. However there are a number of issues which the authors need to address.   The sentence structure needs some attention, missing spacing between sentences. The word the authors use "aggression" needs to be replaced with more appropriate word. Some areas sound 'bitty' with bits of information being put together. It could be reorganised to make the flow better.   Page 1 line 22 'require other' Line 26 'mature' Page 3 line 13 'close' Line 27- 'Doesn't this contradict the model in Fig 2 showing involvement of   recruited monocytes?   Page 4 lines 4-6 'Are you saying that these results do not allow unambiguous   conclusions to be derived? If so, why fascinating data in the next sentence? Line 15 'Contradicts Fig 2 Page 5 line 25-27 Does not make sense. Sounds like MafB and cMaf are not required   Line 33 parenthesis missing Page 6 line 16- Intestinal macrophages - independent of monocyte recruitment Line 26- Microglia do not require monocyte recruitment. Alveolar macrophages do not require monocyte recruitment but can accommodate such recruitment when required   Page 7 line 12   There is a fair chunk of introduction based on mouse data. Perhaps

this title should not say Human and could change to 'In Diseases'   Line line 20, What does 'expend' mean? Page 8 line 17-19: Sentence needs to be restructured Line 22- sentence: What is the implication on the ability to reverse plaque development by blocking monocyte recruitment?   Line 26: Change 'die' and 'egress from' Line 27-28: Please explain how Line 29: Start new paragraph Page 10 line 15: mature   Line 18-22: This sections seems to be just bits of information being put together. Could be made more cohesive byt expanding details and see if they can be connected better. Page 11 line 10: rephrase ' microglia maybe involved in debris

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Immunology
ESPS manuscript NO: 21402
Title: Macrophage populations and self-renewal: Changing the paradigm
Reviewer's code: 00055041
Reviewer's country: Italy
Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji
Date sent for review: 2015-07-14 12:05
Date reviewed: 2015-07-15 19:35

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This   is an interesting   paper. The results are clear and well described.