

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Hypertension

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 29857

**Title:** Association between G-protein  $\beta 3$  subunit gene and isolated SBP elevation of greater than 130 mmHg: A large-scale cross-sectional study in the Japanese population

**Reviewer's code:** 03505551

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Jin-Xin Kong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-08-29 22:56

**Date reviewed:** 2016-09-21 16:08

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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input 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 checked="" 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

This manuscript by Eto and colleagues described results of a study which demonstrate that Japanese males aged  $\leq 49$  years carrying TT genotype on GNB3 C825T might have significantly higher risk in relation to SBP elevation of  $\geq 130$  mmHg. This is an appealing study which emphasize that GNB3 C825T polymorphism may be a useful genetic marker for hypertension. The amount and quality of work is good enough to make the manuscript publishable but I have some queries which are as follows: \* On page 4, Abstract part: AIME must be replaced by AIM. \* Abstract part: SBP should be provided with the full name when it appears for the first time, even though it is well known to specialist. \* The introduction section is too large and described too much of the well known GPCRs activation. \* In discussion part, the authors should provide more detailed discussion to compare the difference of this study with other reported studies of GNB3 C825T polymorphism in Japanese population, rather than a brief citation like "45.7-53.1% in Japanese[2, 24, 28, 35]". \* Why the authors choose the age of 49 as the standard for grouping the population, is it reasonable? How the authors eliminate the influence of aging on the analysis.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Hypertension

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 29857

**Title:** Association between G-protein  $\beta 3$  subunit gene and isolated SBP elevation of greater than 130 mmHg: A large-scale cross-sectional study in the Japanese population

**Reviewer's code:** 00070411

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Jin-Xin Kong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-08-29 22:56

**Date reviewed:** 2016-10-21 17:43

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 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 role of G-protein activation in cardiovascular disorders is well-known. G-Protein  $\beta 3$  Subunit Gene (GNB3) C825T polymorphism is associated with increased intracellular signal transduction. However, the relationship between the GNB3 gene polymorphism (C825T) and blood pressures is inconsistent in different populations. This paper reports a study designed to examine the association between the GNB3 gene polymorphism (C825T) and SBP elevation of  $\geq 130$  mmHg in a cross-sectional study of Japanese. Unfortunately, this paper is of poor quality, and the study was not necessarily very well designed. It is not suitable for publication in its present form. Abstract – The authors state clearly the main results and conclusions of this paper. Introduction – this section is too long. Do not review the subject extensively. The rationale of the study is not sufficiently explained. The authors need to make a more convincing argument of why one would want to study the relationship GNB3 gene polymorphism (C825T) and SBP elevation of  $\geq 130$  mmHg in Japanese. I am unconvinced after the introduction that this is an important gap in knowledge. Methods – Why stratified the subjects by age ( $\leq 49$  years and  $\geq 50$  years)? This needs to be stated. Results – In the



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

multivariable logistic regression analysis, the ORs was only adjusted for age and BMI (without other potential confounding factors?). Therefore, the association found in this paper must still be regarded as tentative. Discussion – The limitations of this study should be discussed. Reference – 1) only 3 of 38 are the last 5 years. 2) The references are in variable format and need to be consistent and in the format required by the Journal.