

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,

Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 37321

Title: Outcomes of Kidney Transplantation in Patients with Hepatitis B Virus Infection:

A Meta-analysis.

Reviewer's code: 03293797 Reviewer's country: Taiwan Science editor: Na Ma

Date sent for review: 2017-11-28

Date reviewed: 2017-12-07

Review time: 8 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[] Grade B: Minor language	[] The same title	[] High priority for
[] Grade C: Good	polishing	[] Duplicate publication	publication
[] Grade D: Fair	[] Grade C: A great deal of	[] Plagiarism	[] Rejection
[] Grade E: Poor	language polishing	[Y]No	[] Minor revision
	[] Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	[] Major revision
		[] The same title	
		[] Duplicate publication	
		[] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This article was well-organized and provided valuable information on managing kidney transplants with HBV infection. If surveillance strategies and treatment policy available, it would be better and more complete.



Baishideng Publishing

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,

Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 37321

Title: Outcomes of Kidney Transplantation in Patients with Hepatitis B Virus Infection:

A Meta-analysis.

Reviewer's code: 00054120

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Na Ma

Date sent for review: 2017-11-28

Date reviewed: 2017-12-08

Review time: 9 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[] Accept
[] Grade B: Very good	[] Grade B: Minor language	[] The same title	[] High priority for
[Y] Grade C: Good	polishing	[] Duplicate publication	publication
[] Grade D: Fair	[] Grade C: A great deal of	[] Plagiarism	[] Rejection
[] Grade E: Poor	language polishing	[Y]No	[Y] Minor revision
	[] Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	[] Major revision
		[] The same title	
		[] Duplicate publication	
		[] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Title: Outcomes of Kidney Transplantation in Patients with Hepatitis B Virus Infection: A Meta-analysis. The authors of this paper presented the result of a systematic literature review that was conducted to identify studies assessing outcomes of kidney transplantation in patients with HBV. The authors concluded that HBsAg-positive status in kidney transplant recipients was significantly associated with graft and recipient poor outcomes with increased risk of mortality and increased risk of allograft loss. Overall the paper is very well-written and they did very impressive data analysis and statistical tests to reach to their conclusion. However, I have few questions and comments to the authors, here they are; 1- I think there was a serious heterogenicity of the study population, they did not take consideration of the presence of comorbidity, the experience of the surgical team and the experience of the transplant center (as far as the



Baishideng Publishing

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,

Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

number of renal transplant/year), no mention of the type and quality of the renal graft (cadaveric versus live donor) and no data about the donors? All these information and data can shift the results in different direction. 2- The authors did not comment on the reason/reasons for high mortality in the HBsAg-positive recipients, was that related to the graft quality, surgical technique, patient-related issues or related to re-activation of the HBV in the liver! I am sure they can look into these details in particular the number of the papers they did review and included in the study was not huge!