

# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

Manuscript NO: 72289

**Title:** Immunosuppressive treatment and radiotherapy in kidney transplant patients: results of a systematic review.

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06100005

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-10-11

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-10-12 20:01

Reviewer performed review: 2021-10-12 20:14

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<ul> <li>[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing</li> <li>[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection</li> </ul>
Conclusion	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection</li> </ul>
Re-review	[ ]Yes [Y]No



Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Interesting read! Minor comments: Remove double line spacing before "due to PCa treatment" in Table 3 (Pettenati et al 2016). Additional consideration for the limitations section may be to include the fact that no conclusions may be drawn concerning the irradiation of the transplanted organ.



# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

Manuscript NO: 72289

**Title:** Immunosuppressive treatment and radiotherapy in kidney transplant patients: results of a systematic review.

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05817597

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBBS

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Associate Specialist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-10-11

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-10-12 01:06

Reviewer performed review: 2021-10-19 10:33

Review time: 7 Days and 9 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ ] Minor revision [ Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection</li> </ul>
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



# Baishideng **Publishing**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA Telephone: +1-925-399-1568 E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

#### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Authors performed a systemic review to address on the research question whether reduction in immunosuppressants is beneficial for kidney transplant recipients who developed secondary malignancies indicated for radiotherapy. While authors claimed that PRISMA guidelines had been adhered to, flow diagram on identification, screening and inclusion of studies via databases and registries had not been provided. 2. The usage of immunosuppressants post-renal transplantation is to avoid graft rejection or failure, at the expense of increased risk of immunosuppression which may lead to development of secondary malignancies. Authors failed to provide details on the characteristics of the study population included, such as living vs cadaveric renal transplant, degree of matching and presence/absence of anti-HLA antibodies, previous infection history, pre-morbid status prior to transplant etc, which may confound physicians' decision on whether immunosuppressants could be weaned down or not. As for the cancer type, majority of the papers included were about prostate cancer, which is a common disease in male only but not female with increased incidence with age even in normal population, regardless of history of renal transplant or use of immunosuppressants., such selection bias had to be addressed in the paper. 3. With suboptimal methodology in this study, inclusion of heterogeneous group of study population and selection bias, it is not surprised that no valid conclusion could be drawn. It is advised that authors should rewrite the paper following all points suggested in the PRISMA guideline with more clearly defined objectives set and more meticulous methodology employed.



### **RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT**

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

Manuscript NO: 72289

**Title:** Immunosuppressive treatment and radiotherapy in kidney transplant patients: results of a systematic review.

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05817597

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBBS

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Associate Specialist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-10-11

Reviewer chosen by: Li-Li Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-06 02:00

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-06 02:20

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<ul> <li>[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing</li> <li>[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection</li> </ul>
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority)       [ ] Accept (General priority)         [ Y] Minor revision       [ ] Major revision       [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous





statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The "RESULTS" was presumably accidentally a typing error duplicating the paragraphs of "MATERIALS AND METHODS". Please revise the manuscript and resubmit. The methodology part is now much well written with flow diagram incorporated.