

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 47860

**Title:** Systematic review of ablative therapy for the treatment of renal allograft neoplasms.

**Reviewer's code:** 02454185

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Jin-Lei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-03-28 09:13

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-03-28 09:27

**Review time:** 1 Hour

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting study addressing a question of clinical relevance; the study was reported by PRISMA. 1. why did you only search PubMed, other databases such as EMBase SCOPUS will provide some studies that were not included in PubMed. please



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

clarify this point. 2. The inclusion/exclusion criteria should be explicitly described. 3. how did you handle skewed data? this should be tested using non-parametric analysis, rather than t test. suggest to add a reference for standard use of statistical inference (Ann Transl Med. 2016 Mar;4(5):91. doi: 10.21037/atm.2016.02.11.)

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☒ No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☒ No

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 47860

**Title:** Systematic review of ablative therapy for the treatment of renal allograft neoplasms.

**Reviewer's code:** 00503176

**Reviewer's country:** Croatia

**Science editor:** Jin-Lei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-03-28 10:56

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-03-28 12:22

**Review time:** 1 Hour

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Of the two aspects of this manuscript that are subject of the review, one is unquestionable: the topic that it deals with is of practical relevance and the work contributes to the field of nephrology. The other aspect - methodological - however,

requires some comments (and revisions, in my opinion). 1. Although it pertains to case reports/series, this is a systematic review and would need to follow the "good practice" of systematic reviews in all aspects. Figure 1 - PRISMA flow-chart misses one "box" depicting the reasons for which 82/110 full-text assessed articles were excluded. A "fully good practice" would also require that publications excluded based on the full-text assessment are referenced ("list of excluded studies"). Here, this might take too much space - however, one of the points of systematic reviews is to provide an overall summary on the topic for the readers, including info about studies that are NOT relevant for the topic (and the reason why) - so that the readers of this particular review do not need to go "back" to searches to re-check and see which publications were excluded (or - considering the topic - on which papers they do not need to "waste" time). 2. Although this methodological topic has been relatively "neglected", systematic reviews and potential meta-analyses (data-pooling) based on case-series and case reports have its methodological rules - I suggest that the authors should read: Murad MH et al. Methodological quality and synthesis of case series and case reports. *BMJ Evidence-Based Medicine* 2018; 23:60-63. In brief, case reports and case series should also be assessed for quality. Murad et al (*BMJ EBM* 2018) depict a tool based on a modification of the New-Castle Ottawa scale for case reports/series. Some other authors have used similar logic/tools even before this methodological paper was published (e.g., Mikačić & Bosnar *Drug Saf* 2016). Next (*BMJ EMB* 2018): a) data from case series providing summary data (e.g., proportions) and individual cases CANNOT be POOLED together. Data from several case series can be pooled BUT NOT "naively" as summing up events/total number, but using meta-analytical methods for pooling proportions (e.g., Freeman-Tukey double-arcsine transformation-based or logit-transformation-based methods) and using the random-effects approach. The same for continuous variables. b) individual cases CANNOT be pooled to provide "summary data". They can only provide



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

descriptive/narrative insight. c) data from case-series providing individual subject info and individual cases can be pooled for the purpose of e.g., detecting associations between some subject-level characteristics and the outcome by including individual data into simple regression models. In my opinion, this work, which is no doubt worthwhile considering the topic - should also be done in a methodologically fully correct way (particularly because of the importance of the topic!) - to provide estimates about, e.g., risks of complications etc. Hence - (i) if there are more than 2 case-series reporting some proportions, they should be pooled meta-analytically (using the adequate method); (ii) if there is a reasonable number of individual cases, either from individual case-reports or with extractable data from case-series, they can be put into a regression model and, e.g., compare RFA vs. "other methods" for e.g., complication rate etc. If this is not possible - than simple summing up should be done. But - take care! - proportions based on individual cases as  $n \text{ (summed)} / N \text{ (summed)}$  may not be a reliable estimate of the "real world". 3. The Methods section states that Fisher exact, chi2 or t-test were used to compare "data". I could see anywhere in the text that this was actually done. If it was - this is erroneous, as explained. The (proper) alternative way is explained in this review.

## **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

### ***Google Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

### ***BPG Search:***

- ☐ The same title



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242

**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243

**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

**<https://www.wjgnet.com>**

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[ Y ] No