



ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 9832

Title: PREECLAMPSIA: SCREENING TOOLS AND DIAGNOSTIC CRITERIA IN THE SUPERSONIC ERA

Reviewer code: 00729478

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2014-03-02 18:36

Date reviewed: 2014-03-07 15:54

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" 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"/> 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)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

General: Very Interesting topic, well presented. Flow of language: acceptable Title: suitable Text structure and content: both are adequate The reference list: most authors with important research in Preeclampsia are included.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 9832

Title: PREECLAMPSIA: SCREENING TOOLS AND DIAGNOSTIC CRITERIA IN THE SUPERSONIC ERA

Reviewer code: 02729282

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2014-03-02 18:36

Date reviewed: 2014-03-16 23:44

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] 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"/> [Y] 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	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> [] Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Comments to the Author General Comments: The authors have reviewed the definition, screening, management of preeclampsia. These findings will be of interest to clinicians and researchers involved in preeclampsia. My evaluation is that the paper is publishable with minor revisions but with more substantial language revisions. 1. Page 3, line 3 from the bottom, “after 2 gestational weeks” should be “after 20...”. 2. Page 4, line 4 and many other places, “NHBEPEP” should be “NHBPEP”. 3. Page 5, line 11 from the bottom, the authors should rewrite the definition of gestational hypertension and preeclampsia, respectively. 4. Page 6, line 2 and many other places, the authors should uniform “preeclamptic” or “pre-eclamptic”. 5. Page 6, line 7, “SBP ≥110 mmHg” should be “170”. 6. Page 7, line 9, the sensitivity “22%” is discrepant from the result in table 1 “27%”. 7. Page 8, line 11 from the bottom, the authors should change to “placental protein 13 (PP-13)” and subsequently, “pregnancy associated plasma protein-A (PAPP-A)”. 8. Page 10, line 5, and Page 15, line 3 from the bottom, “intrauterine growth retardation (IUGR)” should be “fetal growth restriction”. 9. Page 14, line 5, were these polymorphisms about VEGF gene? The authors should describe it. 10. Page 18, line 12, “Lavine” should be “Levine”. 11. The reference 1. The title seems inappropriate. The authors should check it. 12. The reference 2. “CMAE” should be “CMACE”. Furthermore, there are some grammatical and typographical errors throughout the manuscript and reference list which would benefit from a re-read by someone with a better command of English.