

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Meta-Analysis*

**Manuscript NO:** 85849

**Title:** Post-transplant malignancy: Focusing on virus-associated etiologies, pathogenesis, evidence-based management algorithms, present status of adoptive immunotherapy and future directions

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 04382733

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** DO, PhD

**Professional title:** Consultant Physician-Scientist, Doctor, Medical Assistant

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-05-18

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-06-18 22:51

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-06-23 00:36

**Review time:** 4 Days and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty

<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation
<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I compliment the authors for the effort put into writing this article and including a considerable number of references. But I feel there are too many imperfections in writing style as well there are also some incorrections. Among others, I could quote attributing most post-transplant cancers to a viral cause. I also did not understand the rationale behind using this term, "adoptive immunotherapy". Was it made up by the authors? That should be made clear. Regarding HCV-related post-transplant cancers, it must relate to post-transplant cirrhosis, which should also be mentioned.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Meta-Analysis*

**Manuscript NO:** 85849

**Title:** Post-transplant malignancy: Focusing on virus-associated etiologies, pathogenesis, evidence-based management algorithms, present status of adoptive immunotherapy and future directions

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05270042

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Viet Nam

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-05-18

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-07-10 10:09

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-07-18 10:35

**Review time:** 8 Days

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty

<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation
<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a good article that gives an overview of risks and causes of significant morbidity and mortality of post-transplant malignancy. 1. The author should clearly state which organ transplant is susceptible to what kind of virus. 2. The author said that each drug had risks of causing certain types of cancers. Could the author state more clearly which duration of taking the drugs would increase the risk of cancer? 3. The author should be more specific about the carcinogenic mechanism of the virus. 4. If the duration of using immunosuppressive drugs is short, such as in a liver transplant (2 years), is there any risk of carcinogenesis?

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Meta-Analysis*

**Manuscript NO:** 85849

**Title:** Post-transplant malignancy: Focusing on virus-associated etiologies, pathogenesis, evidence-based management algorithms, present status of adoptive immunotherapy and future directions

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05458826

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MBBS, MS

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United States

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-05-18

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-07-10 11:53

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-07-19 13:14

**Review time:** 9 Days and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty

<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation
<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

i applaud the authors effort to write this manuscript. the authors have described the various malignancies in significance to the transplant population which is relevant to a clinician. the only comment i have is this is a repetition of the publishes literature and most of these things can be found in various guidelines in literature.