

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS manuscript NO: 12706

Title: Risk of infectious diseases and cutaneous tumours in solid organ recipients: a meta-analysis of literature ID 00730272

Reviewer code: 02454595

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-07-23 16:05

Date reviewed: 2014-07-29 03:43

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existing	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" 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"/> Existing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In their manuscript the authors performed a literature review to compare the risk of cutaneous infections and tumours in a cohort of transplant recipients. In the results the authors just describe the kind of infections that occurs in such patients, indicating the most frequents. Major comentaries about the manuscript: - In general, the manuscript just describe the results of the papers included in such revision. There is no clear new information in the results. Could the authors indicate in the manuscript what it bring news to the field of interest? - The manuscript just represents a review of literature and do not perform a meta-analysis. In such case, the title of the manuscript should chance because the content of the manuscript do not represents a meta-analysis. - The introduction of the manuscript seems poor. Could the authors improve the introduction with more few lines about the field? - The description of the Materials & Methods section also is very poor. The authors should make a better description of such data research. It this include: the inclusion and exclusion criteria; quality control for studies included; number of papers included, ethnicity and others relevant informations when a review is performed. Minor Comentaries: In my opinion is important to have some legends in the tables, to make easier for some readers.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS manuscript NO: 12706

Title: Risk of infectious diseases and cutaneous tumours in solid organ recipients: a meta-analysis of literature ID 00730272

Reviewer code: 00504838

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-07-23 16:05

Date reviewed: 2014-08-19 07:57

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"/> Existing	<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	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This study provides a comprehensive overview of the incidence and consequences of cutaneous infections and malignancies in organ transplant recipients (OTRs). The manuscript as presented looks more like review paper than a research paper. The authors should highlight their new studies/findings and clearly differentiate them from previous publications. In addition, I would recommend the authors to address the following comments: 1. Page 5: "In a study, nine of 10 HPV detected in organ transplant recipients were gamma-PV and one belonged to the genus beta-PV [17]. Moreover HPV-5 and HPV-8 were the most frequent types and are the same types that can be easily found in epidermodysplasia verruciforme (EV) [18]". The second sentence seems to contradict the first one since HPV-5 and HPV-8 are beta-PV. This paragraph requires further elaboration. 2. Page 5: the discussion on HPV infection in OTRs is surprisingly short compared to other less frequent infections. I would suggest the authors to extend this topic. Also I think it would be interesting to discuss the HPV incidence in the context of cutaneous tumors in OTRs more extensively. 3. Page 6: "cutaneous military tuberculosis". Do you mean miliary? 4. Page 7: "In our cohort, mycosis, mainly represented by onychomycosis, tinea cruris and genital candidiasis, were observed in the 1.8% of cases". Is this data on the table? 5. Page 8: "about the 71% developed NMSCs, with a BCC/SCC ratio of 2.5". Although BCCs may occasionally be more frequent in OTRs, in most studies SCCs tend to outnumber BCCs. I just want to confirm that the BCC/SCC ratio in this study was actually 2.5. 6. In



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>

some instances the tables refer to an infective agent (i.e *Malassezia furfur*) and the text refers to the condition caused for that agent (Pityriasis versicolor). Since this study involves multiple agents and conditions, I would suggest the authors to try to facilitate the connection between both for the reader that is less familiar with a particular section of the study. 7. Why some of the data from the authors (i.e cutaneous tumors) is not included in the tables? 8. Pages should be numbered. 9. Spell out VZV the first time is listed 10. Table 1. Is HZV or VZV? 11. Several grammatical errors need to be corrected.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS manuscript NO: 12706

Title: Risk of infectious diseases and cutaneous tumours in solid organ recipients: a meta-analysis of literature ID 00730272

Reviewer code: 00547586

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-07-23 16:05

Date reviewed: 2014-07-24 23:41

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"/> Existing	<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	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors studied the occurrence of cutaneous infections and skin tumors in a cohort of kidney transplant recipients due to immunosuppressive therapy and tried to compare their data with data recently described in the literature. The authors concluded that skin infections and non-melanoma skin cancer (NMSC) were diagnosed in solid organ recipients and that follow-up programs for the early diagnosis and treatment should be realized. Having a look in earlier published literature in that field, other authors made the same conclusions. What is the new finding in that manuscript. It should be stated and discussed, which is not done herein. Furthermore, the authors compared their data of skin infections and skin cancer rates of kidney transplant recipients with the data of kidney, liver, and heart transplant recipients of other groups/authors, even though the parameters (e.g. age, follow-up time, therapies) of the studies/meta-analysis differ seriously. Is that acceptable? The authors should discuss that extensively. In addition, some data/percentages of the paper published earlier from the same group (Savoia et al. 2011 (ref. 64)) are used in this manuscript again and compared with data of other authors. However, Savoia et al. 2011 deal with 286 transplant recipients, but in the manuscript in hand 436 transplant recipients were described to be recorded. Therefore, some data/percentages cannot fit together. That confusion must be clarified.