PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation
Manuscript NO: 35348
Title: HLA Typing and Crossmatch: A Comprehensive Review
Reviewer's code: 00503062
Reviewer's country: Japan
Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong
Date sent for review: 2017-07-14
Date reviewed: 2017-07-15

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript by Althaf et al. reviewed HLA typing and crossmatch procedure with presentation of a kidney transplantation case. The topic is interesting and the manuscript is well written. But, I have some comments on the manuscript. It is better to show contents of this manuscript first.   Authors use "B cells" and "B and T lymphocytes" in this manuscript. Use either "cells" or "lymphocytes".   Figures and Table: The resolution of figures and table is too bad. Improve it.   References: Authors should follow the journal's instruction for fonts and journal names, etc. There are careless and grammatical errors in English through manuscript. Check the manuscript again. Followings are examples of careless and grammatical errors in English. Page 2, line 5, 6 from bottom. "Systemic Lupus Erythematosus" reads "Systemic lupus erythematosus". Page 3, line 21. "compliment" reads "complement". Page 11, line 10. "human immunoglobulin" reads "anti-human immunoglobulin". Page 13, line 6 from bottom. "in to" reads "into".

Response to reviewer. Changes highlighted in green:

Revision

1. The Journal style for Minireview does not allow a contents to be at the beginning of the manuscript. Instead a core tip is added.
2. I have used lymphocytes and replaced 'cells'
3. The figures were re-drawn at high resolution and the table edited as text.
4. Journals instructions on fonts and references were updated
5. Grammatical errors were all corrected as suggested.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation
Manuscript NO: 35348
Title: HLA Typing and Crossmatch: A Comprehensive Review
Reviewer's code: 03655783
Reviewer's country: Spain
Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong
Date sent for review: 2017-07-14
Date reviewed: 2017-07-20

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Major revision: 1. Page 8: "An offer for a recipient with high cPRA is a high probability of a negative crossmatch". It is a confusing sentence, considering that highly sensitized patients are more likely to have a positive CDC-XM.   2. Being a review, some affirmations within the text would need more references supporting them (i.e. non-HLA antibodies as clinical predictors of transplant outcome, percentages of FP and FN).   3. Page 9: "Here, high titer antibodies trigger activation of complement with deposition of complement proteins on the bead". This is referred as a cause of FN due to prozone phenomenom for SAB tests. However, in these assays there is not an addition of exogenous complement. Are the authors suggesting that endogenous complement proteins present in the sera from patients could lead to these results? Please support with references   Minor revision: 1. It should be noted that serological typing has fallen into desuse and therefore mentioned within the text.   2. Although generally very well-written, there are some grammatical mistakes: HLA antibodies -- anti-HLA antibodies (within all the main body) ever -- even (page 1) in improved -- in improving

(page 1) SAB mentioned for the first time without explanation for the acronym (page 2) compliment -- complement (page 3) dependant -- dependent (page 7) It's range -- Its range (page 9) form -- from (page 10) in to -- into (page 13)

Response to reviewer. Changes highlighted in <mark>yellow:</mark>
Major Revision
1. Thank you for pointing this out it should read positive and not negative crossmatch. I have corrected this and added two more sentences to further clarify the role of cPRA. (Page 12)
2. I have included further references for this as suggested. (Page 10)
3. I have re-written this and clarified the difference between prozone effect and complement-mediated prozone effect. (Page 13)

Minor Revision
1. I have added a statement about that serological typing has fallen into disuse. (Page 7)
2. All errors picked up were rectified.