

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Transplantation*

Manuscript NO: 83435

Title: Is peri-transplant blood transfusion associated with worse transplant outcomes? A retrospective study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00502954

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Canada

Author's Country/Territory: Saudi Arabia

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-17

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-17 17:12

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-28 13:53

Review time: 10 Days and 20 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a clinical study to address a very important aspect of transplantation. Transplant sensitization accelerates rejection is a big challenge in transplantation. This study revealed that peri-transplant blood transfusion does not sensitize the recipients to accelerate rejection. This is a very important finding. The title, data, conclusion and statistic analysis are reasonable. However, some important parts need to be addressed.

1. Figure legends lack of experimental detail, number of samples and statistic analysis.
2. English writing errors should be corrected through this manuscript.
3. Some recent publications studied in the same aspect should be cited and discussed. i.e. Early Blood Transfusion After Kidney Transplantation Does Not Lead to dnDSA Development: The BloodIm Study. Jouve T, Front Immunol. 2022.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Transplantation*

Manuscript NO: 83435

Title: Is peri-transplant blood transfusion associated with worse transplant outcomes? A retrospective study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05927757

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: FCCP, FRCS, MBBS, MS

Professional title: Consultant Cardiac Surgeon, Director, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Saudi Arabia

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-17

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-18 01:14

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-28 14:00

Review time: 10 Days and 12 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thanks for submitting this manuscript. I have the following points to make. 1. Page 2 Methodology - 2nd Paragraph - This sentence needs rephrasing -. The control group included those who underwent kidney transplantation during the same period but didn't require kidney transplantation" as ".....same period but didnt require blood transfusion" 2. I am not an expert in statistics and I assume a statistician will also review the statistical aspects of this paper - as regards the calculation and interpretation of data.