

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12304

Title: Aging and uremia: is there cellular and molecular crossover?

Reviewer code: 02876774

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-07-01 13:38

Date reviewed: 2014-10-06 23:02

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existing	<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"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Interesting article. Overall comprehensive review that will be of interest to diverse academic readership. This paper should be accepted. Major points: The content reviewed is thorough. However, the selection of klotho and AGEs to focus on seems a bit arbitrary. What about other post-translational protein modifications that can be implicated in both ageing and uremia (e.g. protein carbamylation). At the very least, the authors should justify why they chose particular areas to focus on. Minor: Abstract is descriptive, would be more powerful with a concrete or quantitative example. Intro should clearly state this is a review article.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12304

Title: Aging and uremia: is there cellular and molecular crossover?

Reviewer code: 00503266

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-07-01 13:38

Date reviewed: 2014-07-04 10:04

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existing	<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"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

very interesting summary and promising future directions of research in CRF treatment.