

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Cardiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 28929

**Title:** How far cardio metabolic and psychological factors affect salt sensitivity in normotensive adult population?

**Reviewer's code:** 00211908

**Reviewer's country:** Netherlands

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-07-26 08:18

**Date reviewed:** 2016-07-28 14:35

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

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The study was clearly conducted and the results are not conflicting. A few questions to the authors: 1) Is there any data on cost/effectiveness and impact on treatment? 2) Is there any data on the combination of salt depletion and drug treatment? References should be cited according to the requirements of the WJC.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Cardiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 28929

**Title:** How far cardio metabolic and psychological factors affect salt sensitivity in normotensive adult population?

**Reviewer's code:** 00227375

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-07-26 08:18

**Date reviewed:** 2016-08-13 19:58

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<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"/> 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

This is an interesting manuscript about the relations of salt sensitivity to cardiometabolic risk factors and psychological characteristics. The authors demonstrated that 56 (42.7%) of 131 participants were diagnosed with salt sensitivity. In addition, they reported that LDL-cholesterol and depression were associated with salt sensitivity on age and sex adjusted regression analysis. This manuscript is nicely structured. However, the primary criticism of this study is the methods of statistical analyses. The following are my comments. Please consider the extensive revision. (Comments) 1. How was the univariate and/or age and sex adjusted regression model constructed? Why BUN and/or Cre weren't entered in the univariate and/or age and sex adjusted regression model? These variables are considered as marginally significant (Table 1, Student's t-test, P-value < 0.1). I think BUN or Cre seems to be one of the cardiometabolic risk factors. In addition, why the multivariate regression analysis was not applied to verify the independent variables? If anything, I'd like to know the data on the multivariate regression (age, sex, BMI, FBS, LDL-cholesterol, Cre or BUN, and depression). Please consider. 2. Page 9, line 2 Correct "in centimeters" to "in meters". 3. Page 12, Results, 4th

paragraph As for Figure 1, I'm afraid I don't understand well that the authors would like to insist. The description for the result is too simple, so the authors should describe the results in detail. Furthermore, are there differences between 2 groups? I think statistically analyses by two-way repeated measures ANOVA are needed. Please consider. 4. Table 1 As for each variable, as well as Table2, the authors should describe the unit. 5. Table 2 As for depression, is it continuous variable (score) or categorical variable (positive or negative)? If categorical variable, what's the definition of positive or negative? Please consider. 6. Figure 1 Unfortunately, I don't think the authors carefully explain Figure (Figure Legend). The authors should attach an explanatory note about the vertical axes and horizontal axes of the graph. For example, SBP mmHg (vertical axes), 1: at baseline; 2: 2 hours after saline infusion; 3: before sodium and water depletion; 4: after sodium and water depletion (horizontal axes), without or with at least one (cardiovascular risk factor). Please consider. 7. There are several inaccuracies in references list. [2] Not "1966" but "1966-78", [3] Not "1249" but "1249-53", [8] Not "481" but "481-90", [9] Not "459" but "459-67", [10] Not "1465" but "1465-71", etc. The authors should carefully describe.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Cardiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 28929

**Title:** How far cardio metabolic and psychological factors affect salt sensitivity in normotensive adult population?

**Reviewer's code:** 00225292

**Reviewer's country:** India

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-07-26 08:18

**Date reviewed:** 2016-08-17 16:00

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

Innovative work by Authors.