



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Transplantation*

Manuscript NO: 87636

Title: Anti-Thymocyte Globulin (ATG) for Treatment of T- Cell-mediated Allograft Rejection

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04382733

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: DO, PhD

Professional title: Consultant Physician-Scientist, Doctor, Medical Assistant

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: Nepal

Manuscript submission date: 2023-08-20

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-09-10 20:37

Reviewer performed review: 2023-09-10 21:40

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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I compliment the authors, the article is well written, only minor style problems such as using the term "alteration" (better to use change, for instance). The section "Treatment of T Cell-Mediated Rejection" should include and comment on randomized trials addressing the subject.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Transplantation*

Manuscript NO: 87636

Title: Anti-Thymocyte Globulin (ATG) for Treatment of T- Cell-mediated Allograft Rejection

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05821524

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FACP, FASN, FEBS, FRCP, MBChB, MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Consultant Physician-Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iraq

Author's Country/Territory: Nepal

Manuscript submission date: 2023-08-20

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-09-10 22:37

Reviewer performed review: 2023-09-12 13:21

Review time: 1 Day and 14 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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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 type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thanks to the authors: I have the following points: 1. I didn't find a new message from this mini-review. Even it fits the design of a literature review rather than a narrative review manuscript. Furthermore, there is no description of how they reviewed the literature. 2. It needs restructuring and better subheadings with proper descriptions and evidence under each one. The thoughts are mixed between different categories, like the mechanism of action, dosing, etc. 3. Even when they described the triple maintenance therapy, they missed the well-described SYMPHONY Trial, which consolidated the evidence about Induction therapy with ATG and Maintenance with TAC+MMF+PRD. 4. There are many redundancies in the writing. 5. There is no actual proper definition of steroid-resistant Acute TCMR. 6. The authors referred to the study by Hanaway et al. (Ref Number 33, NEJM 2011). They used the study's conclusion of using Alemtuzumab as induction compared to ATG and Basiliximab. They converted it as a treatment for acute rejection!! 7. It would be great if authors added data about the emerging evidence of Anti ATG Antibodies, which is one of the causes of failing ATG therapy and how it should be tackled. 8. There should be a special topic about ATG



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

resistant ATCMR.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Transplantation*

Manuscript NO: 87636

Title: Anti-Thymocyte Globulin (ATG) for Treatment of T- Cell-mediated Allograft Rejection

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05382551

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: Nepal

Manuscript submission date: 2023-08-20

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-09-20 13:07

Reviewer performed review: 2023-09-20 13:29

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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article is within the scope of the magazine and deals with an interesting topic. It is well written and organized. Reading is fluid. A well-designed experiment is presented and the results are discussed. The contribution is original and novel, and represents an advance in the area of knowledge. However, some aspects should be improved: a) The state of the art should be expanded in the field of the experiment. b) The materials and methods used should be explained.