

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Transplantation*

Manuscript NO: 78539

Title: The effect of Panel Reactive Antibodies on T cell immunity reinstatement following renal transplantation

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05562744

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 Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

Answer: Thank you very much for this comment, we have revised the English language throughout the entire manuscript

2. The argument in introduction section starts with immune tolerance 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

Answer: Thank you very much for this valuable comment. We have made the appropriate changes to show that our purpose was to show the importance of PRA in immune phenotype restoration after renal transplantation. The elimination of CD28 molecule may act as a predictor factor for acute rejection not responding to treatment, therefore, the expression of this molecule has great interest in renal transplantation.

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.

Answer: Thank you very much for this interesting point. We have corrected statistics through the manuscript

4. P values would have been nice starting from table 2

Answer: Thank you, this is absolutely right, we have added p values in table 2.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Transplantation*

Manuscript NO: 78539

Title: The effect of Panel Reactive Antibodies on T cell immunity reinstatement following renal transplantation

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05817597

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

Answer:

Thank you very much, we are grateful for your encouraging comments

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Transplantation*

Manuscript NO: 78539

Title: The effect of Panel Reactive Antibodies on T cell immunity reinstatement following renal transplantation

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05821400

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
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

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.

Comment:

Answer: Thank for your comments, we have modified the manuscript, according to your suggestions, and we have made the appropriate corrections in spelling and grammar.