

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 24345

Title: Risk factors for fracture in adult kidney transplant recipients

Reviewer's code: 00504341

Reviewer's country: France

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-01-19 10:40

Date reviewed: 2016-03-01 19:34

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 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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		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 work from Kyla Naylor et al analyzing transplant-specific and overall risk factors for fractures in kidney transplant recipients is another contribution to this issue that is definitely a topic of interest in the evolution of transplanted patients. It is noteworthy that this new study of the authors on the subject, in part reproduced previous results, also confirmed in the literature on this subject. Nevertheless, the analysis performed keeps, as the authors remarked, an important limitation to the study by failing to make an analysis of the immunosuppressive treatments received by the patients. Taking into account recent publications on the significance of an aggressive immunosuppression induction in increasing risk of fracture events and in particular the possibility to lower the risk of fractures with a modification of the regimen of corticosteroids. (E. Nikkel et al. Reduced Fracture Risk With Early Corticosteroid Withdrawal After Kidney Transplant, AM J Transplant 2012; 12 649-659) is understandable that the limitation that presents this study is significant.



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 24345

Title: Risk factors for fracture in adult kidney transplant recipients

Reviewer’s code: 00504150

Reviewer’s country: Canada

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-01-19 10:40

Date reviewed: 2016-03-04 02:55

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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 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 study entitled, “Risk factors for fracture in adult kidney transplant recipients” by Naylor and co-workers is well designed and the manuscript is well written. The topic has already been explored, as discussed by the authors, but the present study is based on a larger sample size. I have only one specific comment. The authors states in the Materials and Methods section (on page 9), “We calculated the incidence rate of fracture (per 1000 person-years) censoring the observation period on the date of death, first fracture, or end of follow-up (March 31, 2013). I am confused with this statement: first fracture censored? Please confirm.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 24345

Title: Risk factors for fracture in adult kidney transplant recipients

Reviewer's code: 00504802

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-01-19 10:40

Date reviewed: 2016-03-04 20:26

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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 paper is generally well written, with excellent English and text organization. This current paper represents a typical epidemiological investigation, linking several administrative databases created for patients' care primarily and only with secondary intention on data analysis. As one would expect, such study would represent a conclusion as valid only as the comprehensive nature (or the lack of thereof) of the underlying database(s). Please note - in the former paper of the Authors, ROC of the model to predict fracture in a limited database was only 0.62 which is not impressive. On the overall, the overall fracture rate was relatively low in the paper, and minor fracture were associated with factors hinting on functional status (e.g., prior falls). A recent review paper in W J Transplantation (Zsom et al.: Minimization vs. Tailoring - Where Do We Stand with Personalized Immunosuppression during Renal Transplantation in 2015? World J Transplant. 2015 (Sept); 5(3): 73-80) reviewed the importance of individualizing immunosuppressive therapy, including on therapy influencing bone health (e.g. steroid). The Authors may wish to review and discuss this paper in the Discussion. This is important, as many former analyses did not adjust for dose of therapy (yes/no only) rather than adjusting for dose of an individual drug Several potential



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>

parameters are not present in the current data analysis, which may have an impact on fracture rate (serum calcium, PTH, bicarbonate) - were these not available or not considered by the authors? Similarly, there is no info on serum creatinine, or estimated GFR. I found this important, as one would expect a graft with less than perfect function would create a higher fracture rate. Several question remains: -the overall fracture rate is quite low... what would be the fracture rate (major and minor) of a general population of similar age/gender? -what would be the overall r^2 of the overall model? In other words - while I understood the relative risk of several factors - how many % of the overall accuracy of the current model explained variation of the fracture risk?



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 Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 24345

Title: Risk factors for fracture in adult kidney transplant recipients

Reviewer's code: 00503243

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-01-19 10:40

Date reviewed: 2016-03-05 22:27

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		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

This is a well written study on an important topic in transplantation as the risk of bone fractures after transplantation. The statistical analysis is well conducted. The main bias of the study, as often in the case of studies based on database, is the lack of informations on immunosuppressive medications as the authors themselves recognizes. The higher risk of fractures for patients affected by cystic diseases should be better explained in discussion. The paper may be published, even if the lack of informations on immunosuppressive drugs remains a relevant limitation



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 Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 24345

Title: Risk factors for fracture in adult kidney transplant recipients

Reviewer's code: 00503175

Reviewer's country: Croatia

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-01-19 10:40

Date reviewed: 2016-01-20 06:02

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		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

Article "Risk factors for fracture in adult kidney transplant recipients" by Naylor et al. according to my opinion, is acceptable for publication. I did not notice any minor or major revision. This article is very interesting for persons involved in the field of kidney transplantation.