



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	The manuscript describes several characteristics of the Exeltra plus 210 hemodialyzer, such as pores, delineation with the aim to ameliorate its filtration capacity. Results of the study to the characteristics of the Exeltra plus 210 are well described: inner/outer surface of the capillaries, pore sizes, fenestrations. However: 1. The Material & Method section is poorly elaborated. It is not possible to comprehend and monitor the study without downloading the previous study with Polyflux 210H. This needs to be corrected. 2. The title and abstract of the manuscript are not in compliance with the complete content of the manuscript. In this manuscript authors are halting between two opinions: only a descriptive study of Exeltra characteristics or a comparative study of Exeltra with Polyflux. This needs to be structured. 3. The comparison with Polyflux 210 is poorly elaborated due to a lack of Polyflux 210H details, e.g. material, high or low flux in the Material & Method section and in the Result section. The title of the manuscript does not represent the content of the manuscript. 4. Table 3 is not correct. Results are presented from Exeltra (210H??) and Polyflux (??), but the legend stated otherwise. Also, the legend must be described more exactly. Examples of doubling the pore density and reducing by half are not clear. 5. Authors does not describe any clinical implications of	1. Additions were made to elaborate on the materials and methods. 2. We apologizes that the heading of the last column of table 3 was labeled mistakenly as Polyflux 210H. The last column was for EXELTRA 210 and not for Polyflux 210H. It was corrected, and we hope that the whole matter is cleared. The only data from our previous study [13] was only for the free diffusivity, D_o, which is common for both hemodialyzers. 3. Table 3 was corrected. 4. Our apologies. The correction was made. Please see comments above for (2) and (3). Also, the legend was revised. 5. This is an excellent point. We intend to address that in future clinical studies. 6. Computer grammatical and spelling



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the use of Exeltra hemodialyzer with respect to bioincompatibility. Will hemodialysis with Exeltra result in more or just less activation of leucocytes, complement of platelets? 6. English language is horrible and needs to be thoroughly improved.	checks were pursued and corrected throughout the manuscript.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		