

Our Ref JAA/006

6 May 2020

Jacob A Akoh  
Consultant Surgeon  
General & Upper GI Surgery Services Directorate  
Level 04  
Derriford Hospital  
Derriford Road  
Plymouth  
PL6 8DH

Telephone: +441752432650  
E-mail: jacob.akoh@nhs.net

Company Editor-in-Chief  
Editorial Office  
World Journal of Transplantation  
**Baishideng Publishing Group Inc**  
7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566

Dear Na Ma

**Living Kidney Donor Assessment: Kidney Length versus Differential Function  
(Manuscript No: 54896)**

With respect to your email of 20 April 2020, I would like to submit a revised version of the above manuscript for publication in the World Journal of Transplantation. My comments are inserted in red in the relevant sections of this letter.

We are pleased to inform you that, after preview by the Editorial Office and peer review as well as CrossCheck and Google plagiarism detection, we believe that the academic quality, language quality, and ethics of your Manuscript NO.: 54896 basically meet the publishing requirements of the World Journal of Transplantation. As such, we have made the preliminary decision that it is acceptable for publication after your appropriate revision. Upon our receipt of your revised manuscript, we will send it for re-review. We will then make a final decision on whether to accept the manuscript or not based on the reviewers' comments, the quality of the revised manuscript, and the relevant documents.

**We are delighted to receive your preliminary response.**

**Step 1: Please select revise this manuscript or not**

Please login to the F6Publishing system at <https://www.f6publishing.com> by entering your registered E-mail and password.

**Step 2: Key points of revising the manuscript**

**(1) *Scientific quality*:** Please resolve all issues in the manuscript based on the peer review report and make a point-to-point response to the issues raised in the peer review report.

Thank you. The manuscript has been revised and further comments inserted below in the relevant sections. Changes to the manuscript are highlighted using Tracker.

**(2) Language quality:** Please resolve all language issues in the manuscript based on the peer review report. Please be sure to have a native-English speaker edit the manuscript for grammar, sentence structure, word usage, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, format, and general readability, so that the manuscript's language will meet our direct publishing needs.

We believe that the language of this communication is satisfactory.

**(3) Special requirements for figures:** Figures must be presented in the order that they appear in the main text of the manuscript (numbered as 1, 2, 3, *etc.*). The requirements for the figures and figure legends include: (A) All submitted figures, including the text contained within the figures, must be editable. Please provide the text in your figure(s) in text boxes; (B) For line drawings that were automatically generated with software, please provide the labels/values of the ordinate and abscissa in text boxes; (C) Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor; and (D) In consideration of color-blind readers, please avoid using red and green for contrast in vector graphics or images.

All figures prepared and arranged in PowerPoint format.

**(4) Special requirements for tables:** Tables must be presented in the order that they appear in the main text of the manuscript (numbered as 1, 2, 3, *etc.*). Please verify that the tables are referred to in the text by their respective Roman numerals and that the numbering order is correct, and format the tables. Please verify that there are no missing or multiple spaces in the text and tables, *e.g.* before or after parentheses, between words, or before or after symbols like +, ×, ±, <, >, ≥, and ≤. Please verify that the special words or letters in the text and tables are correct, *e.g.* *P* (uppercase), *n* (lowercase), *via*, *vs* (lowercase, no punctuation), *in vivo*, *in vitro*, and *et al* (no punctuation) are italicized.

No issues.

**(5) Special requirements for references:** Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout. The author should provide the first page of the paper without PMID and DOI numbers. NOTE: The PMID is required, and NOT the PMCID; the PMID number can be found at <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov>. (Please begin with PMID:) The DOI number can be found at <http://www.crossref.org/SimpleTextQuery/>. (Please begin with DOI: 10.\*\*).

References amended as required. Thank you.

**(6) *Special requirements for article highlights:*** If your manuscript is an original study (basic study or clinical study), meta-analysis, systemic review, the “article highlights” section should be provided. Detailed writing requirements for “article highlights” can be found in the Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision.

Core tip (highlights) section inserted on page 3

**(7) *Ethical documents:*** Please double check the accuracy of all ethical documents and verify the completeness of the documents according to the type of manuscript.

**(8) *Approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s):*** If your manuscript has supportive foundations, the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s) must be provided.

No funding was received for this study.

### **Step 3: Manuscript revision deadline**

We request that you submit your revision in no more than **14 days**.

Thank you for extending this. Both authors were away until this week.

### **Step 4: Verify the accuracy of general information for your manuscript**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Transplantation

**Manuscript NO.:** 54896

**Column:** Prospective Study (This is a quasi-prospective study – retrospective analysis of prospectively collected data)

**Title:** Living Kidney Donor Assessment: Kidney Length versus Differential Function

**Authors:** Jacob A A Akoh and Katharina J Schumacher

Jacob A Akoh and Katharina J Schumacher

**Corresponding author:** Jacob A A Akoh, FRCS (Ed), FRCS (Gen Surg), MBBS, Associate Professor, Consultant General & Transplant Surgeon, Department of Surgery, Derriford Hospital, Department of Surgery, University Hospitals Plymouth NHS Trust, Derriford Hospital, Plymouth PL6 8DH, United Kingdom. Electronic address: [jacob.akoh@nhs.net](mailto:jacob.akoh@nhs.net), Plymouth PL6 8DH, **Devon**, United Kingdom.  
[jacob.akoh@nhs.net](mailto:jacob.akoh@nhs.net)

**Received Date:** 2020-02-24

**First decision:** 2020-04-18

### **Step 5: Peer-review report(s)**

The authors must resolve all issues in the manuscript based on peer-review report(s) and make a point-to point response to the issues raised in the peer-review report(s) which listed below:

Reviewer #1:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade B (Very good)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Minor revision

**Specific Comments to Authors:** In this manuscript, the authors found poor correlation between kidney length and split function in prospective living kidney donors. They recommend not using length of kidney as the sole criteria for choosing which kidney a donor can donate. Study is done well and findings have practical implications. Would recommend reorganizing the discussion part. First paragraph should succinctly summarize the study findings.

Thank you for taking the time to review our article. We agree that the study has practical implications with respect to living kidney donation. As suggested, we have summarised the key findings in the first paragraph of the Discussion.

Reviewer #2:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade B (Very good)

**Language Quality:** Grade A (Priority publishing)

**Conclusion:** Accept (General priority)

**Specific Comments to Authors:** Akoh et al presented this interesting article about living donor assessment kidney length vs differential function. The paper is well written. I have one question 1. It was mentioned that- the proportion of donors with a difference in length above 1cm (34/285) was compared with those with a differential function of 10% or higher (73/285). I believe it will be of interest to the readers to know, who are these donors who had a difference in the length or split function. Please present basic demographics including weight, height, BMI of the donors of these two groups in a table.

Thank you for your critical appraisal of this paper. We agree that information such as the height, weight and BMI of potential donors might help to characterise and possibly understand this group with differences in length between kidney pairs better but unfortunately we do not have this data. Such information would be of higher

importance to the recipients. As the main focus of this paper was to the potential donors, we do not believe the lack of this data dilutes the conclusion. We have amended the Discussion to highlight this limitation.

#### **Step 6: Editorial Office's comments**

The author must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which listed below:

**(1) Science Editor:** Recommend for potential acceptance. 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a prospective study of kidney length in living donor assessment. The topic is within the scope of the WJT. (1) Classification: 2B. (2) Summary of the peer-review report: This study is conducted well and findings have practical implications. Reviewer would recommend accepting the manuscript after revision. This study is interesting and well written. (3) Format: 3 table and 4 figures. 24 references were cited, including 3 references published in the last 3 years. One self-citing article. 2 Language evaluation: A and B. The authors are native English speakers. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors declared that biostatistics review certificate, Clinical Trial Registration Statement, CONSORT 2010 Statement, and Signed Informed Consent Form(s) are not applicable. The authors signed the conflict-of-interest disclosure form and copyright license agreement. The institutional review board approval form should be provided within original version. No academic misconduct was found in the CrossCheck investigation and the Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: (1) Unsolicited manuscript. (2) Without financial support. (3) Corresponding author has not published articles in the WJT.

Thank you. Please note that the corresponding author has published two articles in the WJT:

Akoh JA, Rana T. Effect of ureteric stents on urological infection and graft function following renal transplantation. World J Transplant. 2013;3(1):1-6. doi: 10.5500/wjt.v3.i1.1.

Akoh JA. Key issues in transplant tourism. World J Transplant. 2012;2(1):9-18. doi: 10.5500/wjt.v2.i1.9.

**(2) Editorial Office Director:** 1 Scientific quality: I have checked the comments made by the science editor, and I basically agree with the science editor. The topic of the paper is the living kidney donor assessment, and is within the scope of the WJT. (1) Classification: Grade B, and Grade B; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: Reviewer#00505314 pointed out this study is conducted well and findings have practical implications. Reviewer suggests the authors reorganize the discussion part. First paragraph should succinctly summarize the study findings. Reviewer# 03655859 thinks this paper is well written. It will be a good addition in this field of a living donor kidney transplant. The reviewer suggest the authors to present basic demographics including weight, height, BMI of the

donors of these two groups in a table; and (3) Format: There are 3 figures and 4 tables. A total of 24 references are cited, including 3 references published in the last 3 years. There is one self-citation. 2 Language evaluation: I agree with the comments made by the science editor. 3 Academic norms and rules: I have checked the documents, including the Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form, Copyright License Agreement, and Institutional Review Board Approval, all of which are qualified. The Informed Consent Statement, CONSORT 2010 statement, and Biostatistics certificate do not meet our requirements. The author needs to complete these files. Or we suggest the authors change the manuscript type to "retrospective study". No academic misconduct was found in the CrossCheck detection and Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. The study is without financial support. The corresponding author is the editorial board member of World Journal of Nephrology. 5 Issues raised: (1) the authors need to write the "article highlight" section; (2) the authors need to add the PMID and DOI in the reference list. 6 Recommendation: Conditionally accepted.

Thank you very kindly. Article highlight (Core tip) has been inserted. DOI and PMID where available have also been inserted.

**(3) Company Editor-in-Chief:** I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report and the full text of the manuscript, of which have met the basic publishing requirements, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted with major revision. Before final acceptance, the authors need to meet ethics requirement by submitting correct documents; I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.

We have addressed the critical issues raised by the Reviewers, Science Editor and Editorial Office Director. We have explained that our institution when approving the study advised us that ethical approval was not required. Given the nature of the study (quasi- prospective), we believe the documents submitted are sufficient. This manuscript is original and no part of it has been published before, nor is any part under consideration for publication in another journal. We hope that you will find the revised manuscript acceptable for publication in WJT.

I look forward to hearing from you.



Jacob A Akoh FRCS(Gen), FEBS, FACS  
Consultant General Surgeon & Honorary Associate Professor