



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 66612

**Title:** Simultaneous nephrectomy during kidney transplantation for polycystose does not detrimentally impact comorbidity and graft survival.

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05330633

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, MSc

**Professional title:** Staff Physician, Surgeon

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Brazil

**Author's Country/Territory:** Belgium

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-03-31

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-04-15 12:20

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-04-20 17:34

**Review time:** 5 Days and 5 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [ <b>Y</b> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [ <b>Y</b> ] No
---------------------------------	---

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? A: Yes 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? A: Yes 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? A: Yes 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? A: No. The second paragraph of the Introduction is very sparse and does not contain references to the argument. When mentioning the existing controversies about the indication and time for the pre-transplant nephrectomy, data or references are not provided. Despite being from the author's experience and a situation known in practice, the theoretical reference must be mentioned. A detail in the objective is the word "influence". As we are studying a retrospective cohort, there is no way to talk about influence or causality, but only about association. 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? A: Yes. However, there are some considerations to be made: a) How did a retrospective cohort manage to select exactly 77 patients for each group, over 12 years? Was it coincidence or was there any degree of patient selection? b) the inclusion and exclusion criteria were not mentioned, nor were there any losses from follow-up and how many were excluded. c) a selection flowchart is required as recommended by the Strobe Guidelines. d) since the sample is non-probabilistic and convenient, I suggest the authors perform a post hoc calculation of the power of the test for the presumed global primary outcome. e) the imaging follow-up protocol for screening for graft dysfunction is not described. 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the



**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

study has made for research progress in this field? A: Yes. The results are straightforward, but we must be aware of the limitations in patient selection, as noted earlier. Figure 1 should include the number of patients at risk over time, in the form of a table below the “X” axis. The need for blood transfusion was different between groups, although it did not indicate a statistical difference. As the sample number was not calculated for this type of analysis, it is likely that there is an important difference between transfusion rates. Still, it was not specified what the volume of blood transfused, but only transfused or not. It is thought that the morbidity of a combined surgery requires greater exposure and more significant blood loss. 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper’s scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? A: Yes. The discussion is simple and straightforward, but it covers the most important points. The comparative analysis between the studies in the literature on the subject and the proposed algorithm for the clinical decision to perform nephrectomy or not is very interesting. 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? A: The illustrations and tables are OK. Minor adjustments in Figure 1, regarding the number of patients in risk. 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? A: Yes 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? A: Yes 11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? A: The References are OK. 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

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

organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate?

A: The manuscript is well written. 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? A: There are some missing points regarding Strobe Guidelines, specially the inclusion and exclusion criteria, endpoint definitions, and selection flowchart. 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? A: Yes