



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Transplantation

**Manuscript NO:** 40337

**Title:** Early urological complications after kidney transplantation: An overview

**Reviewer’s code:** 03742333

**Reviewer’s country:** United Kingdom

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2018-06-17

**Date reviewed:** 2018-06-20

**Review time:** 3 Days

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 Grade E: Do not publish	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

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

I have read with great interest the narrative review manuscript entitled “ Early Urological Complications after kidney Transplantation: an overview”. The paper is well written, structured and therefore can be easily followed. The authors summarized the urological complications following kidney transplantation encompassing its



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

epidemiology, prognostic implications to patients and treatment options. It is a relevant topic for the kidney transplantation field as those complications still clinically relevant nowadays. I have some few suggestions that I consider would improve even more the quality of the work. -For authors name according with the journal guidelines please use acronym with no period for middle name. -The email address of all authors is not required -For correspondent author please provide full name, title, institution, address with city, province/state, postcode and country -Please provide ORCID number for authors and information regarding any supportive foundation -Minimum of 5 keywords are required -“Outline of Surgical and Urological Complications” section: please add more references to the first paragraph if any or insert the one used throughout the paragraph. There is just one at the end. The part that describes the aspect of a urinoma on US needs reference as well. Also it is said that US allows “accurate diagnosis of the underlying complication” on paragraph 2, however at paragraph 3 says that “imaging is not very specific in differentiating between different types of fluid collections”. They sound contradictory to me, could the authors revise it. More references are missing along the third paragraph as well. -“Risk Factors and Presentation of Urine Leaks” section: The third paragraph of this section needs more references or some statements are at risk of sounding like just personal opinion of the authors based on their own knowledge. The risk of bias by the authors selecting articles always exists for narrative reviews and if references are missing it worsens this potential feeling on readers. In accordance, the phrase “As with everything in life, prevention is better than cure” should be removed, please. -At the end of “Management of urinary leaks” an extra paragraph could be added to discuss/ summarize the main findings/ proposal of the review for the future. For example, how advances in interventional radiology can minimise problems? This is included in the conclusion section but it is not discussed along the manuscript. Is there any other promising future approach to tackle these



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

complications? Also, it is needed to recognise the limitations of the work. This is a narrative review and therefore lacks the scientific rigour of article selection of a systematic review. It has a strong vulnerability to personal bias on selection of articles; and, databases are not searched in a pragmatic way. All other potential limitations should be recognised -“Conclusions” section: The last two phrases introduce not or underexplored in the manuscript. Those could be better explored if discussed earlier -“Figure” section: title for each figure should follow its number (e.g Figure 1: Donor demographics. A- B-...). Also for the panels just a capital letter in each figure is enough (A- and not 3a-) -“References” section: Some references are not in accordance with the journal requirements (7,26, 27, 30). Please check all references and standardise it following the journal guidelines.

#### **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 Transplantation

**Manuscript NO:** 40337

**Title:** Early urological complications after kidney transplantation: An overview

**Reviewer's code:** 03031042

**Reviewer's country:** South Korea

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2018-06-17

**Date reviewed:** 2018-07-01

**Review time:** 13 Days

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" 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 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**

when the urologic complication is solved by operation or intervention, do you have long-term results of the complication?

**INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**



# Baishideng Publishing Group

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

### *Google Search:*

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- [Y] No

### *BPG Search:*

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- [Y] No