

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hypertension

ESPS manuscript NO: 20515

Title: Estimated net endogenous acid production and risk of prevalent and incident hypertension in community-dwelling older people

Reviewer's code: 00742221

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-06-10 17:42

Date reviewed: 2015-06-10 19:56

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I am very surprised for the methodology and clarity of the Manuscript very well written in the abstract section last line there is a typing error

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hypertension

ESPS manuscript NO: 20515

Title: Estimated net endogenous acid production and risk of prevalent and incident hypertension in community-dwelling older people

Reviewer's code: 00506014

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-06-10 17:42

Date reviewed: 2015-06-26 15:52

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		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

1.The author had declared some of the limitation in which may affects the generalizability of this study, such as the differences in demographic and lifestyle characteristics between those included and those exclude for the analysis; and vegetables intake of those participants in their study groups. 2.It is also an interesting prospective cohort study which may accept for publication. 3.I have no further comment on this manuscript.