



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_8197
Title of the Manuscript:	Structural delineation of the Exeltra plus 210 hemodialyzer's capillary pores as targets to ameliorate its filtration
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. The aims of the study are not clarify and underline in the background/introduction section. The conclusions should meet the study aims, hence there is a need to define precisely the study aims. 2. In the result section the authors should not include any introduction/backgrounds, explanations, references, repeat sentences from other parts of the paper. Description of methods they ought to move to the methods, explanation and interpretation of the results to the discussion. 3. The best resume of the manuscript would be some graph/figure presenting results/conclusions, that emerged from the study. 4. There is not much items on reference list, only a few are original paper. References need somewhat updating, most of them refer to several years before. 5. There are several misspelling and grammar errors, especially in the result and discussion section.	1. Thank you. A paragraph was added at the end of the introduction and in the abstract to summarize the objective of the study. 2. Thank you. We revised the results section and we moved all sentences as suggested. 3. We felt that detailing the results in a tabulated form gives accurate information. We modified Table # 3 accordingly. Please advise if further modifications are needed. 4. This is a difficult area where most of the information is available only from the manufacturer in a confidential, non- refereed forms. Please further advise. 5. Thank you. We pursued computer spelling and grammar checks throughout the document. Comments 6 – 10 are repetitions of comments 1 – 5, and are addressed above.
Minor REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

	none The manuscript titled: „Structural delineation of the Exeltra plus 210 hemodialyzer’scapillary pores as targets to ameliorate its filtration” aimed to characterize the fenestration on the outer and the inner surfaces of capillaries of the high flux Exeltra plus 210 cellulose hemodialyser. The authors have come to the conclusion, that the transport of uremic toxins through the capillaries’ walls could be enhanced through doubling the inner diameters of the capillaries, increasing the fenestration density on the inner walls, and applying an electric potential. The study is generally well designed, well presented and the results are potentially of a certain interest. The main idea of the manuscript gives some approach to the improvement of diffusivity of uremic toxins and in this way to the increasing of uremic toxins’ clearances. There are however some issues that should be addressed.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	6. The aims of the study are not clarify and underline in the background/introduction section. The conclusions should meet the study aims, hence there is a need to define precisely the study aims. 7. In the result section the authors should not include any introduction/backgrounds, explanations, references, repeat sentences from other parts of the paper. Description of methods they ought to move to the methods, explanation and interpretation of the results to the discussion. 8. The best resume of the manuscript would be some graph/figure presenting results/conclusions, that emerged from the study. 9. There is not much items on reference list, only a few are orginal paper. References need	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	somewhat updating, most of them refer to several years before. 10. There are several misspelling and grammar errors, especially in the result and discussion section. 11. Considering the whole article, in my opinion, manuscript might be accepted for publication in the BJASt pending changes mentioned above.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The study is generally well designed, well presented and the results are potentially of a certain interest. The main idea of the manuscript gives some approach to the improvement of diffusivity of uremic toxins and in this way to the increasing of uremic toxins' clearances. There are however some issues that should be improved (see above). Considering the whole article, in my opinion, manuscript might be accepted for publication in the BJASt pending changes mentioned above.	