

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 3586

Title: Update on hemolytic uremic syndrome (HUS): diagnostic and therapeutic recommendations

Reviewer code: 00503226

Science editor: Zhai, Huan-Huan

Date sent for review: 2013-05-08 10:41

Date reviewed: 2013-05-11 04:57

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input checked="" 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"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear editor -in-chief i red the following manuscript "Update on hemolytic uremic syndrome (HUS): diagnostic and therapeutic recommendations" and i have the following comments 1. the definition and first part that denotes to infectious causes of HUS is to long and redundant. 2. it is better to bring all treatment under one entry and then discuss one by one. 3. some heading are very confusing , such as " infectious HUS not diarrhea associated, this part when going through the detail are also very confusing and redundant.and it is needed to add some thing about the urinary tract induced thrombotic microangiopathy. 4. in the treatment part it has been mentioned that "bilateral nephrectomy is necessary.... if we cannot control the blood pressure, with modern antihypertensive it is not longer recomends and the autghore should consider the incomplete messages. 5. the part on Eculizumab is to long and unnecessary. 6. some important viruses that cause CMV particularly in transplantation should be noted such as CMV and parvovirus B 19 7. WRITING AND GRAMMATICAL corrections strongly needed.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 3586

Title: Update on hemolytic uremic syndrome (HUS): diagnostic and therapeutic recommendations

Reviewer code: 01200577

Science editor: Zhai, Huan-Huan

Date sent for review: 2013-05-08 10:41

Date reviewed: 2013-05-16 22:13

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[Y] Grade A (Excellent)	[] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[] Accept
[] Grade B (Very good)	[Y] Grade B: minor language polishing	[] Existed	[] High priority for publication
[] Grade C (Good)	[] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[] No records	[] Rejection
[] Grade D (Fair)	[] Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	[Y] Minor revision
[] Grade E (Poor)		[] Existed	[] Major revision
		[] No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors presented a comprehensive and updated review on HUS, which provides useful information on this interesting topic. The paper is well written. There are only few points that, in my opinion, should be clarified. In particular, I'd like to receive more information and data on the acquired and secondary forms of aHUS. Moreover, at page 22 HELLP syndrome is mentioned, but no information has been provided on the meaning and clinical presentation of this condition. Then, there are some grammar and orthographic mistakes in the text and figures, please revise them (i.e. calcineurine and in figure 3 there are some comments in Italian). Finally, Table 1 is not cited in the text.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 3586

Title: Update on hemolytic uremic syndrome (HUS): diagnostic and therapeutic recommendations

Reviewer code: 00616006

Science editor: Zhai, Huan-Huan

Date sent for review: 2013-05-08 10:41

Date reviewed: 2013-05-28 20:21

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 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 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"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

COMMENTS FOR AUTHORS World Journal of Nephrology MANUSCRIPT # 3586 REVIEWER # NN Maurizio Salvadori Update on hemolytic uremic syndrome (HUS): diagnostic and therapeutic recommendations The authors of this manuscript review the current literature about the hemolytic uremic syndrome (HUS). The authors focused on the genetic as well as on the gene modifications in this context. In addition, the authors described therapeutic aspects of HUS within this review. Although HUS is a rare disease the relevance of this review is high, since HUS is characterized by a very high mortality. Therefore, the reviewer recommended this manuscript for publication after major revision. Major points: 1.) The last sentence of the abstract should be removed. 2.) The authors should present the keywords used for the medline search in more detail. They should described the number of hits etc in the manuscript too. 3.) The authors should avoid the presentation of relevant information in brackets (eg. p 4) 4.) The author should give the data mentioned at p 5, para 1 last sentence. 5.) The manuscript is -at least in part- not easy to read since the content of most sentences are not linked. This point is of highly relevance. 6.) The headlines should be reworded, e.g. "clinical presentation". 7.) The authors should described the secondary diseases of HUS in more detail. 8.) The authors should significantly modify Figure 3 since the current version is confusing and -in part- non-readable. 9.) Figure 5 is not a figure but a table. 10.) A native speaker should revise the manuscript.