

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Nephrology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 27681

**Title:** Hyponatremic hypertensive syndrome - a retrospective cohort study

**Reviewer's code:** 00503179

**Reviewer's country:** Denmark

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-06-11 14:30

**Date reviewed:** 2016-06-22 16:40

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"/> 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

This study addressed the usefulness of intervention for the treatment of variceal bleeding. This subject has been widely addressed for several years now and it is even a part of the normal treatment for selected patients.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Nephrology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 27681

**Title:** Hyponatremic hypertensive syndrome - a retrospective cohort study

**Reviewer's code:** 00060498

**Reviewer's country:** India

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-06-11 14:30

**Date reviewed:** 2016-06-22 16:41

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> 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 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 argument is quite interesting, and the Authors' experience remarkable. I underline the value of the paper, which can be published.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Nephrology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 27681

**Title:** Hyponatremic hypertensive syndrome - a retrospective cohort study

**Reviewer's code:** 00503339

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-06-11 14:30

**Date reviewed:** 2016-06-11 22:42

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> 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

Good story well told! But how did Case 1 get lost and why was a hypertensive, hyponatremic, encephalopathic five year old boy likely to die not found? A valid story on its own, even for India! Would there be enough information to include a paragraph or two on what may be a major problem in India, that of not continuing medical care in those likely to die if untreated? Overall, a well told story of a clearly instructive clinical point!