

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Infectious Diseases

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 21215

**Title:** Clinical research in febrile neutropenia in cancer patients: Past achievements and perspectives for the future

**Reviewer's code:** 01308634

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2015-07-06 11:16

**Date reviewed:** 2015-09-01 17:16

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 checked="" 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 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"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		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

The manuscript is well written and contained useful information for readers. There is some inconsistency of style. For example, in chapter 5, the authors use "introduction, discussion and conclusion", however, this style is not suitable. The number of references should be checked carefully, for example, 56, 204.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Infectious Diseases

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 21215

**Title:** Clinical research in febrile neutropenia in cancer patients: Past achievements and perspectives for the future

**Reviewer's code:** 01213276

**Reviewer's country:** Serbia

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2015-07-06 11:16

**Date reviewed:** 2015-07-21 19:19

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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 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"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		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

The manuscript is well written and it covers the key points within the literature. It does not required amendment.