

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS manuscript NO: 28383

Title: Bacteremia in hemodialysis patients

Reviewer's code: 00506591

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-07-01 18:27

Date reviewed: 2016-07-10 07:43

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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

1. Thanks for the efforts on this manuscript. 2. Bacteremia in a dialysis patient is a big topic and challenging to cover in a minireview. Perhaps you would be better off focusing on catheter related BSI or something more focused 3. Please utilize tables to focus the readers. You could have a table on the drugs and dosing for Locke therapy. You could have a table on the bugs and a few recommendations for therapy. But with limited verbage in a minireview, tables and figures are helpful 4. I understand you submitted this to the world journal, but your epi data is all over the place which makes it hard for the user to relate to. Not sure that can be fixed, it is just a comment 5. Under incidence, is there data on HD catheters v fistulas v grafts? 6. Causative organisms could be listed in table format and thus provide more room for expanding other sections 7. Sites of infection....that is not related to bacteremia. I don't think that section fits in the manuscript. You have a few lines discussing BSI and vascular access infection, the the first sections really offer nothing to the paper 8. I do not get the flow of the paper.....you discuss bacteremia then focus on catheter related BSI's. This makes the paper seem unfocused, would honestly suggest focusing on CRBSI since you are limited in space with a minireview 9. Locke therapy is always challenging. Please



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

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

provide specific dosing recommendations, likely in table format 10. I would also provide contraindications to lock therapy and more information on when it will not work 11. Any comments on antibiotic impregnated catheters? 12. Should treatment be broken down into antibiotic management and catheter management? 13. Please discuss indications for HD cath removal in more detail. You have about 2 sentences without a lot of details. 14. Reference 2 says "chapter 2" but is in reference to a journal. I think tha needs fixed

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS manuscript NO: 28383

Title: Bacteremia in hemodialysis patients

Reviewer's code: 00503255

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-07-01 18:27

Date reviewed: 2016-07-14 07:13

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"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" 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 comprehensively reviewed clinical and bacteriological features of bacteremia in hemodialysis patients. The paper is well-written and provides valuable information regarding this field. Some points should be revised. 1. page 4, line 19: This cohort study was done in Denmark, not in Belgium. 2. page 5, line 14: "ORGANISM" should be changed to "ORGANISMS" 3. page 13, line 6: "American Journal of Kidney Diseases" should be changed to "Am J Kidney Dis" 4. page 14, line 2: "Sogaard OSs" should be changed to "Sogaard OS" 5. page 19, line 23: "Bmj" should be changed to "BMJ"

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS manuscript NO: 28383

Title: Bacteremia in hemodialysis patients

Reviewer's code: 00503313

Reviewer's country: United Arab Emirates

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-07-01 18:27

Date reviewed: 2016-07-19 03:10

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" 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

1- I was expecting to know more about this problem in Japanese hemodialysis population, rather than the international literature 2- You have in Japan the best hemodialysis survival, how much this is affected by infections 3- You did not give details about CRBSI management, like empirical AB therapy, duration of therapy, ext... 4- Reference number 7 was mentioned in the introduction as Belgium study, and then as a Danish study