PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Transplantation*

Manuscript NO: 78539

Title: Effect of panel reactive antibodies on T cell immunity reinstatement following renal transplantation

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05562744

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FACS, MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor, Senior Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: Greece

Manuscript submission date: 2022-07-03

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-07-17 06:32

Reviewer performed review: 2022-07-17 13:34

Review time: 7 Hours

Scientific quality	[　] Grade A: Excellent　　[　] Grade B: Very good　　[Y] Grade C: Good [　] Grade D: Fair　　[　] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[　] Grade A: Priority publishing　　[　] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing　　[　] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[　] Accept (High priority)　　[　] Accept (General priority) [　] Minor revision　　[Y] Major revision　　[　] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes　　[　] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I commend the authors because the idea behind the study is very good. This is a case control study involving 71 patients and Patients were classified in two groups, PRA[-] [n=43] and PRA[+] [n=28] group. Lymphocyte and their subtypes were similar between two groups at T0, while their percentage was increased at T3, in PRA[-] compared to PRA[+], 23[10.9-47.9] vs 16.4[7.5-36.8]µ/L, respectively, p=0.03. Lymphocyte changes in PRA[-] patients, included a significant increase of CD4 cells, p<0.0001, CD8 cells, p<0.0001, Tregs, p<0.0001 and reduction of NKs, p<0.0001. PRA[+] patients showed increase in CD4, p=0.008, CD8, p=0.0001 and reduction in NKs p=0.07. CD4CD28null and CD8CD28null cells, although initially reduced in both groups, they were stabilized thereafter. This is very important in terms of Antibody mediated rejection pathogenesis, however there are some major issues that need to be addressed: 1. Major revision of English language is required 2. The argument in introduction section starts with immune tolerence through CD28null lymphocytes but there is a discordance with the argument and the aim of the study. PRA is a surrogate for acute antibody mediated rejection 3. The authors present results as median and range which means that the continuous data is not distributed normally but they use student T test and ANOVA for intergroup comparisons which is wrong non=parametric test should be used for two group analysis (They have also stated Mann Whitney U which is suitable) and also the multiple group comparisons should have been performed by The Kruskal Wallis with Tukey or Bonferroni modification.   4. P values would have been nice starting from table 2

Scientific quality	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[Y] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Well written manuscript with clearly defined study objectives and methodologies

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It was pleasure to read your interesting work. I have suggested some changes and some additional information to clarify few questions. These are attached in file. I also recommend to get it reviewed for spellings and grammar.