



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27080

Title: Six end-stage renal disease patients benefited from first non-simultaneous single center 6-way kidney exchange transplantation in India

Reviewer's code: 00503339

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-05-11 18:34

Date reviewed: 2016-05-12 00:21

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The plan is fascinating, especially for India. What is not told is whether only relatively rich people were included and whether there was any special compensation to Donors. Considering the reported exploitation of women who did not consent to donate having their kidneys "stolen" in India and then sold - mainly to non-Indian recipients, this Reviewer needs assurance that all that is described in the present report is truly a fair recounting of the "Ethics" employed as well as the surgical and immunologic outcome in the 6 recipients presented. If the fiscal issue did not dominate, and the Transplants were done irrespective of the recipients financial status, Hooray for the advance in India and may it continue and expand. Some of the English needs minor tweaking.



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27080

Title: Six end-stage renal disease patients benefited from first non-simultaneous single center 6-way kidney exchange transplantation in India

Reviewer's code: 00503228

Reviewer's country: Iran

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-05-11 18:34

Date reviewed: 2016-05-16 14:41

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The topic of kidney paired transplantation is not of interest in the context of outcome; this is a hot topic in transplantation ethics, and authority policies. So, all these detailed data from the patients provides no novelty. In a medical perspective, they are only 6 simple ESRD patients who got transplanted from matched living donors. I recommend authors, instead, prepare a paper in which they talk about 61% of ESRD patients who have no access to any type of RRT; and how resources can be directed in a way to provide this population with RRT. I think it would be the hottest topic. Or if authors insist in the KPD, I'd recommend them to give a brief description of their center report, and then make it a systematic review to give a global perspective; and also compare different aspects of the practice (including cultural, authoritarian, religious, economic and ... barriers) for KPD in different parts of the world.



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27080

Title: Six end-stage renal disease patients benefited from first non-simultaneous single center 6-way kidney exchange transplantation in India

Reviewer's code: 00503014

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-05-11 18:34

Date reviewed: 2016-05-20 17:23

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In general, the draft is interesting and had been good written. Only little question is concerned. 1. In the report, one acute rejection was noted. Are there any comments to the event from author? Do the authors conduct protocol biopsy or not? Time -zero biopsy? 2. Is there any shared-decision making process for the "6-way Kidney exchange "protocol?