



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Nephrology

**Manuscript NO:** 42477

**Title:** CHOICE OF DIALYSIS MODALITY PRIOR TO KIDNEY TRANSPLANTATION:  
DOES IT MATTER?

**Reviewer's code:** 02454185

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Ying Dou

**Date sent for review:** 2018-09-26

**Date reviewed:** 2018-09-27

**Review time:** 21 Hours

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 checked="" 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**

This is a comprehensive overview of modality for dialysis before transplatation. I have several comments to improve the paper. 1. "when most of patients initiate hemodialysis (HD) via catheters which is associated with adverse outcomes"---needs



**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

expansion to indicate what kind of adverse events. 2. In discussion the meta-analysis, the authors need to clarify the outcome for the assessment of efficacy. different modality can favor different outcome. Readers are confusing on why the 2016 meta-analysis favors "concluded that PD was a better choice of pre-transplant dialysis modality than HD". 3. If tang's meta-analysis included only retrospective studies, the quality is very limited. 4. The authors focused only on retrospective studies; are there randomized controlled trials? or is these ORs adjusted; this is very important because retrospective studies are prone to bias.

#### **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 Nephrology

**Manuscript NO:** 42477

**Title:** CHOICE OF DIALYSIS MODALITY PRIOR TO KIDNEY TRANSPLANTATION:  
DOES IT MATTER?

**Reviewer's code:** 00503233

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Ying Dou

**Date sent for review:** 2018-10-03

**Date reviewed:** 2018-10-04

**Review time:** 1 Day

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 excellent review over a very controversial topic; I only have a few minor observations: -As it is virtually impossible to set up an RCT vs PD, we have to rely on observational studies which do not allow for definitive conclusion. This limitation



**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

shpuld be mentioned in the discussion -Selection bias might apply to PD patients, which are usually more motivated and compliant than HD -Lead time bias might apply to preemptive transplantation -Any information available on home HD?

#### **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 Nephrology

**Manuscript NO:** 42477

**Title:** CHOICE OF DIALYSIS MODALITY PRIOR TO KIDNEY TRANSPLANTATION:  
DOES IT MATTER?

**Reviewer's code:** 00503182

**Reviewer's country:** Egypt

**Science editor:** Ying Dou

**Date sent for review:** 2018-10-03

**Date reviewed:** 2018-10-05

**Review time:** 2 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 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 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**

Please keep the factors evidence-based especially those related to professional bias for selection HD versus PD in USA e.g. incentives of HD units !!!!!



**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

#### 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 Nephrology

**Manuscript NO:** 42477

**Title:** CHOICE OF DIALYSIS MODALITY PRIOR TO KIDNEY TRANSPLANTATION:  
DOES IT MATTER?

**Reviewer's code:** 00503260

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Ying Dou

**Date sent for review:** 2018-10-03

**Date reviewed:** 2018-10-07

**Review time:** 3 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 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 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**

Jain et al. reported the impact on allograft and recipient outcomes after kidney transplantation comparing peritoneal dialysis (PD) and hemodialysis (HD) as the modality of dialysis. This manuscript is interesting and important, because the



**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

summarized review is rare to compare dialysis modality before kidney transplantation. However, some concerns have been raised. (1) The authors indicated lower rates of delayed graft function (DGF) in PD patients compared with HD patients. However, almost all the papers are reported before 2000. As the authors know, the methods of kidney transplantation including immunosuppressive drugs are dramatically changed during 10 to 20 years. Therefore, the authors should indicate more recent evidences about DGF. (2) The authors indicated that thrombotic events in PD patients before kidney transplantation are more common compared with those in HD patients. As the reason, the authors showed that PD patients have increased pro-coagulant factors. However, they did not indicate why pro-coagulant factors increase in PD patients. The authors should indicate the reasons. (3) It is controversial whether dialysis modality influences development of post-transplant diabetes mellitus or not. The authors should indicate the reasons. (4) The authors indicated that mortality benefits in PD patients are seen dependent on cardiovascular mortality. On the other hand, there are many studies reported that survival benefits of PD over HD were not found. The authors should indicate why the mortality benefits in PD patients are controversial.

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

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

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

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

- The same title



**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)

Duplicate publication

Plagiarism

No



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Nephrology

**Manuscript NO:** 42477

**Title:** CHOICE OF DIALYSIS MODALITY PRIOR TO KIDNEY TRANSPLANTATION:  
DOES IT MATTER?

**Reviewer's code:** 00503286

**Reviewer's country:** Romania

**Science editor:** Ying Dou

**Date sent for review:** 2018-10-03

**Date reviewed:** 2018-10-07

**Review time:** 4 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input checked="" 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**

The work "CHOICE OF DIALYSIS MODALITY PRIOR TO KIDNEY TRANSPLANTATION: DOES IT MATTER?" should be published in this journal, after minor corrections with the editor. In the other hand, some figures, diagrams or images



**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

were welcome!

#### 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 Nephrology

**Manuscript NO:** 42477

**Title:** CHOICE OF DIALYSIS MODALITY PRIOR TO KIDNEY TRANSPLANTATION:  
DOES IT MATTER?

**Reviewer's code:** 00504316

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Ying Dou

**Date sent for review:** 2018-09-26

**Date reviewed:** 2018-10-13

**Review time:** 17 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 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 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 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 a well-written review paper containing systemically-integrated summary and clear discussion which merit publication. It will be of clinical benefit to American patients who have to make a choice between PD and HD before kidney transplantation.



**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

When described the results of “citation 25”, what should be also showed are the mortality data of the patients initiating RRT with HD in order to understand the subsequent comparison between PD and HD.

#### **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 Nephrology

**Manuscript NO:** 42477

**Title:** CHOICE OF DIALYSIS MODALITY PRIOR TO KIDNEY TRANSPLANTATION:  
DOES IT MATTER?

**Reviewer's code:** 00502999

**Reviewer's country:** Argentina

**Science editor:** Ying Dou

**Date sent for review:** 2018-10-03

**Date reviewed:** 2018-10-14

**Review time:** 11 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 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**

This review article by Jain et al is about HD vs PD as the preferred RRT approach to kidney transplant patients. Major issues: The manuscript has to follow WJN guidelines: There is no Core Tip, the Tables are not located correctly in 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  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

dio not follow the format, as neither references do. Abstract: Sixth line: Replace "chose". Wrong tense and semantics according to the message of the paper. Introduction: At first, please comment on the prevalence of CKD among the worldwide population (10%) Address after first paragraph how dialysis impact on graft survival vs preemptive transplantation. The second paragraph of this section has to be redone: "In the 2015..." is wrong. The fourth sentence is confusing at all. Replace waitlist by waiting list. Third paragraph was to be redone as well. Replace bacteriemia by infections. "Hence, for patients who are planning to receive a transplant..." is better than what is written. The authors do not comment in this section about the benefits of a better preserved residual urinary output for PD patients vs HD ones. Last sentence of this paragraph: Replace didn't by did not (it laso appears in other parts of the manuscript). The controversies described by the authors are not discussed. One of the main differences between both modalities is biased on the time elapsed from the start of either PD or HD and the transplant. The longer the time in waiting list, the worse the prognosis of the graft, probably independently of the dialysis method employed. Please, address and discuss, not just describe. Make the mansucript critical. The topic about thrombosis is non-conclusive, too long and leads nowhere. What is the role of HD catheters, antiheparin antibodies and the risk of thrombosis?. What can authors add about chronic hemodiafiltration vs conventional HD vs PD impact on grafts?. Is chronic hemodiafiltration a better option when related to kidney transplant prognosis? The manuscript requires major polishing of the English language.

## INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

### *Google Search:*

- The same title
- Duplicate publication



# 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)

Plagiarism

No

***BPG Search:***

The same title

Duplicate publication

Plagiarism

No



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Nephrology

**Manuscript NO:** 42477

**Title:** CHOICE OF DIALYSIS MODALITY PRIOR TO KIDNEY TRANSPLANTATION:  
DOES IT MATTER?

**Reviewer’s code:** 02889203

**Reviewer’s country:** Greece

**Science editor:** Ying Dou

**Date sent for review:** 2018-10-03

**Date reviewed:** 2018-10-14

**Review time:** 11 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 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 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 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 a good paper. The authors should add the metabolic disorders including metabolic acidosis as a difference between PD and HD related to DGF or cardiovascular mortality after transplantation. The authors outlined the importance of the preservation



**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)

of residual renal function and this is good.

#### INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

##### *Google Search:*

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

##### *BPG Search:*

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No