

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 20603

Title: Single vs dual (en bloc) kidney transplants from donors ≤ 5 years of age: A single center experience

Reviewer's code: 03290767

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-06-15 16:34

Date reviewed: 2015-08-14 04:40

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 checked="" 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"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

KDPI is not universally familiar - can you provide a reference or detail what the components are? I find the statement on page 13 'The ultimate number of nephrons in each kidney (1.4-3.5 million)' at odds with my understanding of nephron number per kidney, which is each kidney can have between 600,000 and 1.5 million nephrons. If this is incorrect, can you provide a reference?

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 20603

Title: Single vs dual (en bloc) kidney transplants from donors ≤ 5 years of age: A single center experience

Reviewer's code: 00504341

Reviewer's country: France

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-06-15 16:34

Date reviewed: 2015-08-17 14:44

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"/> 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript of Yousef Al-Shraideh et al, exhaustively described a current issue, directly related to the ever-existing problem of acute organ shortage, namely the optimum use of small paediatric donors. The paper analyzes the results obtained in their unit, in relation with: 1) the appropriateness of the use of small paediatric donor, 2) the use of two techniques: Single versus Dual (en bloc) transplant. While this work is not original, the extensive and enlightening analysis performed by the authors regarding donor evaluation, recipient selection, surgical technique, immunosuppression, post-transplant management, as well as the interesting and elaborate discussion, makes this study, useful to the readers and recommended for publication.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 20603

Title: Single vs dual (en bloc) kidney transplants from donors ≤ 5 years of age: A single center experience

Reviewer's code: 00010832

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-06-15 16:34

Date reviewed: 2015-06-15 17:02

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

Nice study. Data are presented well and in depth. Recommend publication