

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 21698

Title: Dynamics of circulating microparticles in chronic kidney disease and transplantation: Is it really reliable marker?

Reviewer's code: 00225252

Reviewer's country: Germany

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-07-27 14:03

Date reviewed: 2015-07-28 14:49

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 authors provide a nice summary about EMPs and their clinical relevance. Minor corrections have to be made as highlighted in the manuscript file.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 21698

Title: Dynamics of circulating microparticles in chronic kidney disease and transplantation: Is it really reliable marker?

Reviewer's code: 02445684

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-07-27 14:03

Date reviewed: 2015-07-28 21:23

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 checked="" 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 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 authors summarized the roles of circulating endothelial microparticles on predicting vascular disease, endothelial dysfunction, and graft rejection in patients with chronic kidney disease and kidney transplantation. Although this issue is of clinical significance, I do have several issues I feel need to be addressed and would welcome the author's comments on these. Major points: 1. Given that the use of quantification of MP as a clinical tool is still controversial, the comparisons between different methods to measure MP should be discussed. 2. To serve as a marker, measurement of MP for age- or gender-related heterogeneity needs normalization. What is the normal reference of MP in adult and pediatric population? Any gender difference? Is its level related to CKD staging? 3. Can endothelial MP serve as a marker for therapeutic response? Any reports about specific MP-lowering medication? 4. Although the authors showed the relationships between MP and arterial stiffness (e.g., PWV), what is its role on hypertension and CV mortality in patient with CKD? 5. The authors might provide the major blocks for future clinical application of MP. Minor points: 1. There is lack of page number. 2. There are some typos, such as "glomerulonephritides" and "micropartciles".