ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation
ESPS manuscript NO: 33432
Title: Biomarkers in renal transplantation: An updated review
Reviewer's code: 00504316
Reviewer's country: China
Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song
Date sent for review: 2017-02-12
Date reviewed: 2017-02-20

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[Y] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good		[ ] Duplicate publication	
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Minor revision
	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	[ ] Major revision
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a very fascinating review in which the authors systematically summarized the studies and updated the knowledge of biomarkers in kidney transplantation. Nevertheless, this article is a bit long and needs to be reduced and compressed. Some suggestions for the authors to improve this manuscript.   1. There are cross sections and duplicated contents in this article, especially in the part of "PRE-TRANSPLANT BIOMARKERS", "IRI"and "DGF". Stratify the biomarkers by clinical events throughout this article, including graft survival, graft function, IRI and DGF, acute rejection (either cellular or AMR) and CAD. Under each clinical event, describe the biomarkers at different timing points (Pre-transplant or post-transplant) or different sample type (tissue, serum or urine), etc.   2. Cite the references in the tables when necessary.   3. Correct Typo errors.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 33432

Title: Biomarkers in renal transplantation: An updated review

Reviewer's code: 00504017

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song

Date sent for review: 2017-03-08

Date reviewed: 2017-03-15

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[Y] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good		[ ] Duplicate publication	
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Minor revision
	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	[Y] Major revision
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

World Journal of Transplantation.   The authors performed a review on the biomarkers in renal transplantation including diagnosis, therapeutic response and prognosis. The provided information is update, plenty ad comprehensive. Some issues need to be addressed.   COMMENTS: 1. The whole text of the manuscript is suggested to be reorganized and rearranged using subcategories and subtitles. Some paragraphs are not clear cut, but some only contained two sentences. 2. Brief summary and references in tables may help readers easy to understand and gain information. We encourage the author to provide the information.   3. The author only provided genes overexpressed in the CRM on Table VII. Statistically significant expression both under and over expression using for biomarkers are suggested to be provided. 4. Some tables are poor arrangement such as Table VIII. 5. Some references are not in uniformed format. 6. Full names are suggested while first abbreviation showed. Full name instead of abbreviation is more appropriate showing in the table title.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation
ESPS manuscript NO: 33432
Title: Biomarkers in renal transplantation: An updated review
Reviewer's code: 00503322
Reviewer's country: United Kingdom
Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song
Date sent for review: 2017-03-08
Date reviewed: 2017-03-22

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for
[Y] Grade C: Good	polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	publication
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[Y] Grade C: A great deal of	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade E: Poor	language polishing	[Y] No	[ ] Minor revision
	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	[Y] Major revision
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The review "Biomarkers in renal transplantation: an up to date" is written in extensive detail, but has several major issues, which mandates major revision for its publication in any transplant journal.   1. Title of the manuscript "Biomarkers in renal transplantation: an up to date" needs correction,   "an up to date .....?" Should be either "an update",   "an up to date review" or "an updated review". 2. The abstract needs rewritten so that it reflects the whole subject clearly. It is very unclear and muddled with non-specific statements. 3.The introduction section does require further policing to make the basis for writing the manuscript clear. 4. How the literature search was carried out should be clearly described. 5.Rest of the sections are just copies from published papers with extensive repetition of the same materials, which makes the paper least interesting, non-readable and difficult to grasp. 6. Each section needs to be reduced by at least 50% and repetition be avoided. 7. Abbreviations need to be carefully revised. 8. There are too many references, which can be reduced by 50%. 6. There are several errors related to English grammar and punctuation, which need special attention.