

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Respirology

ESPS manuscript NO: 14115

Title: New therapies for COPD, lung regeneration

Reviewer code: 00608206

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-09-20 13:30

Date reviewed: 2014-09-23 00:22

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y] 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"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Reviewer's report (ESPS Manuscript NO: 14115) Title: Title: New therapies for COPD, lung regeneration Running Title: Regeneration for COPD Reviewer's report: Review article on new therapies for lung regeneration in COPD. Topic of interest serviced properly. References are acceptably date: 28% (19/68) of the last 5 years. COMMENTS TO AUTHORS: GENERAL COMMENTS Review article on new therapies for lung regeneration in COPD. Topic of interest serviced properly. References are acceptably date: 28% (19/68) of the last 5 years. The structure of the article and its general outline is correct. There are no ethical problems. SPECIFIC COMMENTS: TITLE: Specific, it adequately contains the primary endpoint. (Words: 6). ABSTRACT: Define and explain the concepts well properly structure review article. Key words: Correct INTRODUCTION: Clear and correct introduction. Well structured. The DIFFERENT SECTIONS (Abstract, Introduction, Current therapies for COPD, Overview of lung regeneration, Regeneration-promoting agents, Cell therapy, Future directions and references) are clear and well structured. The figure is simple but summarizes the review. The review is presented in a clear and correct form. REFERENCES: References are acceptably date: 28% (19/68) of the last 5 years. MINOR COMMENTS Orthographic revision: It is not necessary

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Respirology

ESPS manuscript NO: 14115

Title: New therapies for COPD, lung regeneration

Reviewer code: 00608132

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-09-20 13:30

Date reviewed: 2014-11-13 19:06

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<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"/> Existing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Nice work and very nice point. Just you need to revise the English a bit more especially in the introduction

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Respirology

ESPS manuscript NO: 14115

Title: New therapies for COPD, lung regeneration

Reviewer code: 00570480

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-09-20 13:30

Date reviewed: 2014-10-06 18:47

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Existing	<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	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> [] Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank-you for the opportunity to read this review of potential lung regeneration therapies in COPD. The review is written well and is quite comprehensive in its review of current literature which may lead to new approaches to therapy. there are no editing issues. I would improve the document by making the figure more detailed to include greater details of the mechanisms by which each approach to regeneration works.