

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7682

Title: Immune Monitoring Post Liver Transplant

Reviewer code: 02439579

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-11-29 12:08

Date reviewed: 2013-12-09 15:00

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1.The authors stated all the methods used in clinic to monitor immune function post liver transplant, and gave out the differences in them 2.The authors did not give some direction for future development of immune monitoring post liver transplant. 3.The authors did not indicate some useful combination for immune monitoring post liver transplant in clinic. 4.The paragraph of "Dendritic Cells" is inadequate supported by the references.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7682

Title: Immune Monitoring Post Liver Transplant

Reviewer code: 02438890

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-11-29 12:08

Date reviewed: 2013-12-11 03:36

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[Y] Grade A (Excellent)	[] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[] Grade B (Very good)	[Y] Grade B: minor language polishing	[] Existed	[] High priority for publication
[] Grade C (Good)	[] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[] No records	[] Rejection
[] Grade D (Fair)	[] Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	[] Minor revision
[] Grade E (Poor)		[] Existed	[] Major revision
		[] No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In the article "Immune monitoring post liver transplant" the author reviewed the current available methods for the monitoring of the immune system after liver transplantation. This paper is a very comprehensive work discussing the many aspects of immune monitoring including clinically widely used and experimental methods of immune monitoring. I believe that this review deserves publishing in the World Journal of Transplantation. My only suggestion is to correct typing errors (Introduction section second paragraph: minimizeside, Other drugs section: futureimmune, Biopsies section: andprotocol etc.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7682

Title: Immune Monitoring Post Liver Transplant

Reviewer code: 00011087

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-11-29 12:08

Date reviewed: 2013-12-11 22:45

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a very interesting and well performed review evaluating the current available options for monitoring the immune system after liver transplantation. The authors accurately described different methods and assays and highlighted pros and cons for each. The interesting conclusion of the review was that no single method is able to meet the diagnostic requirements and that multiple assays may be needed in the same patient to trace an accurate immunological profile. The review is well designed and well written with clinical relevant conclusions and appropriate examination of published data.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7682

Title: Immune Monitoring Post Liver Transplant

Reviewer code: 00722339

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-11-29 12:08

Date reviewed: 2013-12-16 00:26

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Author; Liver transplant immune suppressors used because it is vital dose adjustment. This review has examined an important issue in the article. Comparative tables with additional topics can be presented more dramatically. English spelling errors should be corrected. Published with minor revisions.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7682

Title: Immune Monitoring Post Liver Transplant

Reviewer code: 00522743

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-11-29 12:08

Date reviewed: 2013-12-16 06:56

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The review reports all relevant issue in the immunological monitoring after organ transplantation. However, the Authors performed a descriptive review. Nevertheless, studies are not cited according to their relevance, nor the degree of evidence and the strength of recommendation are reported. In addition, the large parte of evidences reported by Authors are not specifically related to liver transplantation, being obtained in studies on kidney transplant patients. Nevertheless, the manuscript can be ameliorated. I suggest: 1. The peculiarity of the liver transplant setting should be identified and reported in the introduction (low risk of rejection, high risk postoperative course, complexity of identification of rejection among other cause of liver dysfunction, ...). The immunological differences versus kidney, heart, intestine transplant should be discussed. Alternatively, the Authors can modify the title in "Immuno monitoring in organ transplantation" and summarize in a table the tests used in the different organs transplanted. 2. The clinical application(s) of immunological tests should be reported in a dedicated table. The sensitivity and specificity of most relevant tests should be specified according to the literature. 3. Among all reported immunological tests, Authors should identify (new table) those performed in the past (old tests), those currently used in the clinics, those potentially available in the near future in order to be very informative for the readers. 4. The histopathology of liver rejection should be reported according to most used scores. 5. A limitation paragraph with identification of shadows should be hopefully included before the conclusion paragraph. 6. A 5-6 point take-home message should be reassumed in a separate table or in the conclusion paragraph.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7682

Title: Immune Monitoring Post Liver Transplant

Reviewer code: 00068914

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-11-29 12:08

Date reviewed: 2013-12-16 15:09

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have reviewed the field of immune monitoring in patients who have received a liver transplant. It is an important subject and the authors have emphasized the need of monitoring and intervening in the immunomodulatory response of the organ recipients so that chances of successful engraftment can be improved and/or long and short term graft rejection by the recipient can be minimized. While the other molecular methods have been described well application of cell based immune modulation particularly by generating donor-recipient hematopoietic chimerism and specially using Treg cells or hematopoietic stem cell transplantation has not been sufficiently emphasized. The quality of the review improve considerably if these aspects are further highlighted in the review. The scientific language of the review is good and the references are up to date.