

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

ESPS manuscript NO: 11481

Title: How the kidney hyperfiltrates in diabetes: From molecules to hemodynamics

Reviewer's code: 00506347

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-05-24 22:07

Date reviewed: 2014-05-30 22:01

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Good information. Interesting and helpful. Writing is a little choppy so style needs a little work. I think in between the section on type 1 and 2 diabetes there needs to be a paragraph that explains the basic differences between the 2 clinical illnesses and why this means that mechanisms might be different

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

ESPS manuscript NO: 11481

Title: How the kidney hyperfiltrates in diabetes: From molecules to hemodynamics

Reviewer's code: 00068625

Reviewer's country: Poland

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-05-24 22:07

Date reviewed: 2014-06-30 16:45

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The problem presented in the paper has been discussed for several years, but it still remains actual topic. Literature citations are appropriate and adequate. The paper is organized in a clear and easy to understand manner. I suggest a little more broadly describe the role of connexins in the renal hyperfiltration. I believe that this is the most interesting part of the publication.