

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12336

Title: Renal biopsy practice: what is the gold standard?

Reviewer code: 00503255

Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song

Date sent for review: 2014-07-03 17:18

Date reviewed: 2014-07-04 10:20

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	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This review paper is well-written and provide comprehensive information about renal biopsy practice. Some points should be revised. 1. page 5, line 10-12: The reference article should be cited in this sentence. 2. page 7, line 13: "Mackinnon ? al" should be changed to "Mackinnon et al" 3. The reference No 8: The volume and page numbers should be added.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12336

Title: Renal biopsy practice: what is the gold standard?

Reviewer code: 00503282

Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song

Date sent for review: 2014-07-03 17:18

Date reviewed: 2014-07-12 19:32

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" 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"/> 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	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The work is excellent. There are a few minor points which should be corrected as: Death: <0,1%, is 0.1%. There are a few abbreviations which are not standardized, eg. Bleeding time (BT), ASA is not fully spelled, DDAVP is also not fully spelled in the beginning.