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Reviewer's report:

Zhuang et al present a clinical descriptive study investigating circulating DC and monocyte subsets correlating to patients with different stages of atherosclerosis. While the authors can not conclude any cause or effect from this study, it is nonetheless an interesting description of the modest changes in mononuclear phagocytes associated with atherosclerosis vulnerability.

There are some minor comments that need addressing:

1) Methodology: Did the authors exclude CD16+ NK cells and granulocytes from contaminating their monocyte subset gating? How were monocyte counts assessed? 'blood routine examination' is a little vague

2) Figure 1: It would be helpful to change graphs to dot plots to show variability

3) Discussion: Last sentence on pg 17 should be removed. This cites a review and I do not think there is any compelling evidence from recent data that specific monocyte subsets can differentiate into "M1- or M2-type" macrophages only

4) Study limitations: last sentence does not make sense and should be re-written or removed.

5) Attention to English is needed throughout

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown? 
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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