

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology

ESPS manuscript NO: 21186

Title: Human papilloma virus vaccination: Review article and an update

Reviewer's code: 00186131

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-07-05 12:30

Date reviewed: 2015-09-29 13:12

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input 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"/> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" 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 manuscript is interesting and well written. However, the author did not discuss the incidence of HPV in HIV-infected patients. I suggest to complete the review discussing this topic and the HPV vaccination in HIV-infected patients.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology

ESPS manuscript NO: 21186

Title: Human papilloma virus vaccination: Review article and an update

Reviewer's code: 00736297

Reviewer's country: Poland

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-07-05 12:30

Date reviewed: 2015-07-18 05:41

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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 name of paragraph "Human Papilloma Virus and its Pathogenesis" shall be changed into "Human Papilloma Virus" or "Human Papilloma Virus and its Biology", because it is lacking any information about pathogenesis. There are some editorial mistakes in manuscripts e.g. spacing, missing dots, typing symbols instead using particular symbol e.g. +/_ etc. The reviewer thinks that description of vaccine appearance like "Cervarix is a homogeneous, turbid, white suspension. It should not be administered if it appears otherwise." is not necessary in scientific paper and it seems like a fragment of Cervarix leaflet. Reference style shall be amended with accordance to journal rule. Position 36 and 102 of references are probably some kind of mistake? The article claim to some kind of update, but only 14 of 111 of total references are papers from 2014 and 2015.