

ESPS Peer-review Report**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Nephrology**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 10668**Title:** CKD Prediction is an Inexact Science: The Concept of 'Progressors' and 'Nonprogressors'.**Reviewer code:** 00503043**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji**Date sent for review:** 2014-04-13 17:02**Date reviewed:** 2014-04-23 15:55

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I reviewed the article titled as "CKD Prediction is an Inexact Science: The Concept of 'Progressors' and 'Nonprogressors.'" The authors has written a brief review and here they focuses on the limitations and drawbacks of the NKF K/DOQI CKD staging model. Also they discuss some new CKD risk assessment models and some CKD case reports of different clinical features. The paper is well written and highlights an important topic about CKD staging and synthetic clinical assessment. But the paper needed just a few revisions: 1. The manuscript appears very long and too much detailed in some paragraphs. It might be reasonable to reduce the number of the presented specific CKD case reports with different clinical features, and meanwhile the number of Figures should be reduced. 2. The font of Figure 8, 12,13,18,20,21,22 is too small and fuzzy, thus the readability of several labellings is severely affected. 3. There are a lot of abbreviations, the authors should make a section for abbreviations, so it will be more understandable. Overall, this paper merits publishing in the World Journal of Nephrology after making following corrections.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 10668

Title: CKD Prediction is an Inexact Science: The Concept of 'Progressors' and 'Nonprogressors'.

Reviewer code: 00503292

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-04-13 17:02

Date reviewed: 2014-05-04 17:16

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This has been included in my comments in the PDF document.