

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Transplantation*

Manuscript NO: 74968

Title: Acute kidney injury and the compensation of kidney function after nephrectomy in living donation

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05430684

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Chief Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Greece

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-16

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-16 06:46

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-18 23:16

Review time: 2 Days and 16 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input type="checkbox"/>] Anonymous [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="checkbox"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I studied carefully the manuscript entitled "Acute Kidney Injury and the Compensation of Kidney Function after Nephrectomy in Living Donation" by Okumura et al. The present manuscript is in fact a narrative review; hence, specific inclusion or exclusion criteria lack. Moreover, since it cannot provide answer to the clinical question presented in its title, its conclusions reflect the author's own views. Despite that such a kind of scientific approach might be of some value, a systematic review could contribute much more to what is called "evidence-based medicine". A systematic approach could be qualitative, if not quantitative; this kind of review ask a specific question and answer it by summarising evidence that meets a set of pre-specified criteria following a protocol. Under this perspective, the authors are wellcome to re-rwrite their review in a systematic manner. This means to perform a literature search following a predefined protocol, include a PRISMA flow diagram (see: <http://prisma-statement.org/prismastatement/flowdiagram.aspx>) and at least qualitatively evaluate the included studies (as these presented in Table 1). Moreover, it would be desirable if they could assess their summary of evidence using GRADE (see: <https://bestpractice.bmj.com/info/toolkit/learn-ebm/what-is-grade/>).

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Transplantation*

Manuscript NO: 74968

Title: Acute kidney injury and the compensation of kidney function after nephrectomy in living donation

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03850246

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-16

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-02-13 07:35

Reviewer performed review: 2022-02-13 08:35

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this review authors focused on the compensation of kidney function after nephrectomy in living donors, discussing factors that have been identified as being associated with kidney recovery in donors including age, sex, BMI, remnant kidney volume, eGFR, and various comorbidities. The paper is well written and logically organized. The manuscript is clear and presented in a well structured manner. Just minor, would recommend to briefly introduce the role of histology/biopsy in the setting of AKI patients with particular reference to the potential role. In this regard please quote:

- Cima L et al. Histopathology and Long-Term Outcome of Kidneys Transplanted From Donors With Severe Acute Kidney Injury. *Prog Transplant*. 2019 Mar;29(1):36-42. doi: 10.1177/1526924818817054.