

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 21665

Title: Use of genetically-engineered pig donors in islet transplantation

Reviewer's code: 00070310

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-07-27 11:16

Date reviewed: 2015-07-28 17:09

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper reviewed islet xenotransplantation using pig donors. This is interesting and almost parts are well written. However, it will require some changes before it can be accepted for publication. 1, Please show how to select papers of islet xenotransplantation based on this research. 2, Please show breakthrough or impact as to islet xenotransplantation in this manuscript. 3, This paper requires editorial correction.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 21665

Title: Use of genetically-engineered pig donors in islet transplantation

Reviewer's code: 00045831

Reviewer's country: India

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-07-27 11:16

Date reviewed: 2015-08-05 18:49

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [] The same title	<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"/> [] Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript by Bottino et al is well written with a vision to increase available β cell sources and fill the gap for islet transplantation. However to date genetically engineered cells/tissues are not approved in clinical practice. But the concept to employ the latest techniques to generate genetically engineered pigs as islet donors has a long bearing for the human kind. Genetic modifications in pigs may have beneficial effect in reducing IBMIR, rejection under xenotransplant set up. Minor mistake to be corrected (Hyper acute rejection: starting of the paragraph should be One of the major instead of one One the major

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 21665

Title: Use of genetically-engineered pig donors in islet transplantation

Reviewer's code: 00504802

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-07-27 11:16

Date reviewed: 2015-08-10 12:55

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper is generally well written and this Reviewer feels that only minor changes are necessary for this project. The subject - genetically modify porcine donors to enable pancreatic cell transfer into non-humane primate species is highly relevant to the World Journal of Transplantation missions and relevant to ongoing or future human research to occur. The review has an extensive Bibliography and the Authors appear to be recognized experts on the subject. Minor comments about the text: -2nd page, 1st para (in the sentence, which carries Ref #8): change expression "in the clinic" into "in clinical practice" or "clinical medicine" -3rd page, about 1/3 of the page (when describing pig litter sizes) - the Authors state that the phylogenetic difference between human and pig is "approximately 1 million years". That is surely incorrect - even I believe the chimpanzee are separated from human > 2 million years (as no interbreeding can take successfully) - so I suspect pig would be at least an order of magnitude more. Please, check and correct -same comment as the first one for the last paragraph before "Conclusion": change expression of "will not be translatable to the clinic" to "will not be translatable to clinical practice" (or: "will not be translatable to human medical practice/care") In terms of English: minor revision is necessary. In several parts of the paper (1st paragraph of



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>

Introduction; 1st paragraph describing of the text after chapter title “Hyperacute rejection: alpha 1,3 galactose (GAL)” or the last paragraph before “Conclusions” are good examples) the sentences are too lengthy and the use of comma are excessive. It would help if an another native speaker of English with a different style would edit the paper further.