

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

Manuscript NO: 42570

Title: Vaccinations in Kidney transplant Recipients: Clearing the Muddy Waters

Reviewer's code: 03475636

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Jin-Lei Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-09-29

Date reviewed: 2018-10-01

Review time: 1 Day

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 think overall this is important topic. However, I would like to see this review paper in more details as below: Major comments: 1. Please discuss more on meningococcal vaccination in the text of the manuscript, not only in the Table for all patients receiving eculizumab for acute antibody mediated rejection and prophylaxis eculizumab for



**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

aHUS and eculizumab treatment for aHUS/TMA after kidney transplantation. 2. Please also additionally discuss on the finding from a very recently published randomized controlled trial "Immunogenicity and safety of double versus standard dose of the seasonal influenza vaccine in solid-organ transplant recipients" Vaccine. 2018 Oct 1;36(41):6163-6169. 3. Also, please add future perspective; e.g. Vaccination against cytomegalovirus Minor comments: There are misused/misspelled words 1. Re: "there was not difference found in adverse effects between the 2 vaccines"; "not" should be "no" 2. It's not "Prevar-7"; should be "Pevnar (PCV7)" 3. It's not "herpatic neuralgia"; should be "postherpetic neuralgia" 4. "papilloma virus" should be "papillomavirus" 5. "Live attenuated vaccines" is misspelled. 6. "Entameoba histolytica" should be "Entamoeba histolytica" 7. "calcineurine" is misspelled. 8. "Hepatitis B vaccination" is misspelled. 9. "health care workers" should be "healthcare workers" 10 "rotavirus vaccine and menla vaccine"??? 11 "maintenance levels of immunosuppression is reached" is not correct in grammar. 12 "should continued to be recommended to all KTRs." is not correct in grammar. 13 "it's not recommended" "it's" is not professional writing.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

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

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication



**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

[] Plagiarism

[Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

Manuscript NO: 42570

Title: Vaccinations in Kidney transplant Recipients: Clearing the Muddy Waters

Reviewer's code: 02726701

Reviewer's country: Chile

Science editor: Jin-Lei Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-09-29

Date reviewed: 2018-10-02

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

Comments The manuscript is very good. It is concise, well written and easy to read and to implement in daily practice. It covers common clinical scenarios in solid organ transplantation and it can have rapid application in day to day practice. I have just one comment. In the Pre-transplant Vaccinations section, it is suggested that patients be



**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

vaccinated before their transplantation when they have chronic kidney disease (CKD). Please, clarify in what CKD stage do authors recommend to vaccinate the patients. This is not just rhetoric because most CKD patients do not progress to end stage kidney disease and never need a kidney transplantation. The same, but from the other side may be to affirm that all adults need some vaccines irrespective their CKD status. The core tips and abstract section are OK. The table is clear and easy to read and understand. The reference section is very comprehensive and up to date. In summary, I enjoyed the manuscript and I think it needs minor edition.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

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

BPG Search:

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