



**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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

Manuscript NO: 38508

Title: The role of Narrow Band Ultra Violet Radiation as an add on therapy in peritoneal dialysis patients with refractory uremic pruritus

Reviewer's code: 03475636

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-04-25

Date reviewed: 2018-04-25

Review time: 10 Hours

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

I recommend to add the discussion on the use of charcoal and Combined hemodialysis-hemoperfusion for uremic pruritus (PMID: 25366503, PMID: 1801857); which unfortunately limited the use in peritoneal dialysis patients given the lack of

vascular access. Otherwise, the manuscript looks good, but there are some minor corrections needed as below: - add on should be "add-on" - "kappa opioid receptors" should be kappa opioid receptors - "centre" should be "center" - "till" should be "until" - "one third" should be "one-third of the dosage" - "was around 62.5%"; "around" should be "approximately" - "Initially Patient are usually managed with emollients and topical analgesics"; "patient" should be "patients" - "multiple hypothesis" should be "multiple hypotheses" - "The presently employed regime is very cumbersome and not patient friendly."; friendly is not formal, recommend to change the sentence.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No



**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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

Manuscript NO: 38508

Title: The role of Narrow Band Ultra Violet Radiation as an add on therapy in peritoneal dialysis patients with refractory uremic pruritus

Reviewer's code: 00503255

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-04-25

Date reviewed: 2018-04-25

Review time: 12 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input 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 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

The authors retrospectively studied the effects of narrow band ultra vaviolet B (UVB) radiation as an add on therapy in peritoneal dialysis patients with refractory uremic pruritus and showed that narrow band UVB phototherapy is effective for these patients.

The paper is well-written and has interesting findings. 1. page 4, line 21-22: "However that beneficial effect was not demonstrated in a subsequent randomized controlled trial Ko et al". This is not right. Ko et al showed narrow band UVB improved significantly in the VAS score in pruritus patients, but these effects were not superior to those of long wave UVA radiation therapy. 2. page 5, line 2: "Broadband UVB" should be changed to "Broad band UVA".

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No



**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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

Manuscript NO: 38508

Title: The role of Narrow Band Ultra Violet Radiation as an add on therapy in peritoneal dialysis patients with refractory uremic pruritus

Reviewer's code: 02895483

Reviewer's country: Germany

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-04-25

Date reviewed: 2018-04-28

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input 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 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 type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Introduction: „Sometimes the pruritus could be severe ...“ I suggest „Sometimes the pruritus is severe ...“ “Narrow Band UVB decreases the proinflammator cytokines level and ...“ I suggest “Narrow band UVB decreases proinflammator cytokine levels

and ...” “In this study we aim” I suggest “In this study, we aim” Material and Method: “patients were referred to dermatology department at” I suggest “patients were referred to the dermatology department at” Inclusion criteria: “End Stage Renal disease and be on Peritoneal dialysis” I suggest “end stage renal disease and be on peritoneal dialysis”. This is repeated several times later in the text. The full stops should follow immediately after the last word in the sentence, not detached from the last word and immediately in front of the first word on the next sentence. This is repeated several times later in the text. “Topical emollients, Topical capsaicin, Anti Histaminics, Pregabalin, Gaepentin, Trincyclic antidepressants”. I suggest “topical emollients, topical capsaicin, antihistamines, pregabalin, gabapentin, trincyclic antidepressants”. Protocoll. “then it was continued in the same dose” I suggest “then it was continued at the same dose” .../serum iron profile / Hemoglobin were evaluated” I suggest .../serum iron profile / hemoglobin were evaluated” Relapse. “... The mean time to relapse was around 10 +/- 4.3 weeks” I suggest “... The mean time to relapse was approximately 10 +/- 4.3 weeks” Discussion: “.Initially Patient are usually managed” I suggest “. Initially, patients are usually managed” “.. compared to Broadband UVB phototherapy”. I suggest “.. compared to broadband UVB phototherapy”. “In our study we included patients with End Stage Renal Disease who are on peritoneal dialysis” I suggest “In our study, we included patients with end stage renal disease on peritoneal dialysis” “.. not be applicable in patients who are already on peritoneal...” I suggest “.. not be applicable in patients already on peritoneal...” “.. and reduction in level of proinflammatory cytokines level”. I suggest “.. and reduction in levels of proinflammatory cytokines”. “suggesting that a lot of other factors played a role” I suggest “suggesting that other factors played a role” “We need larger well designed randomised controlled trials ...” I suggest “We need to come up with larger well designed randomised controlled trials ...” The authors refer to 12

weeks treatment. However, they later mention that several patients relapsed. It would help if they could plainly state the total observation / follow up period. Was there any change in the average/ mean VAS score at the end of the follow up period? I find it a pity that there was no control arm. The authors remark that the Treatment was not well accepted by the patients. I would appreciate a little more Information as to what was not accepted: the duration of the treatment? How long was each session? As this was a retrospective study, how do the authors know what the patients complained about? Why could the patients not appreciate the improvement in pruritus?

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No