

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 21860

Title: Role for urinary biomarkers in diagnosis of acute rejection in the transplanted kidney

Reviewer's code: 00503254

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-08-13 08:50

Date reviewed: 2015-09-04 14:55

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

None.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 21860

Title: Role for urinary biomarkers in diagnosis of acute rejection in the transplanted kidney

Reviewer's code: 00503203

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-08-13 08:50

Date reviewed: 2015-08-24 23:40

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The present article critically reviews current literature on urinary biomarkers of acute renal allograft rejection and discuss their probable clinical utility. The topic is interesting and the review is very well written. Minor comments. 1. Two very recent papers should be discussed and quoted (Transplantation 2012; 93: 1136-1146; J Am Soc Nephrol 2014; 25: 1586-1597). 2. There are several typing errors (mainly missing spaces between words) that need to be corrected.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 21860

Title: Role for urinary biomarkers in diagnosis of acute rejection in the transplanted kidney

Reviewer's code: 00503204

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-08-13 08:50

Date reviewed: 2015-08-13 17:30

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" 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"/> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

An excellent article. Just a minor comment. The authors mention limitations for some biomarkers, but not others. Could I please ask them to include limitations for most (if not all) biomarkers.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 21860

Title: Role for urinary biomarkers in diagnosis of acute rejection in the transplanted kidney

Reviewer's code: 00503339

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-08-13 08:50

Date reviewed: 2015-08-13 23:33

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This detailed and clear review of reported tests used to detect immunologic allograft injury versus other causes of transplant malfunction is lucid and helpful. The Authors are in a good position to propose 3 or 4 comparative studies that they believe might sharpen our understanding of which tests are most likely to distinguish immunologic allograft rejection from allograft injury due to vascular insufficiency and or bacterial infection. It might also be helpful to propose a short menu of initial and subsequent tests starting with the time of Transplant that should be included in the follow up of all new renal allograft recipients. There is a growing feeling that properly chosen measurements of biomarkers might improve overall outcome of kidney transplants.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 21860

Title: Role for urinary biomarkers in diagnosis of acute rejection in the transplanted kidney

Reviewer's code: 00503228

Reviewer's country: Iraq

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-08-13 08:50

Date reviewed: 2015-08-15 20:00

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Introduction is too much long 2. A methods section is required to present your approach in search and selection of the studies, and also what exactly were the markers which have been reviewed in this article (there are data from quite more markers than those specified in the abstract). 3. References are outdated: no study from 2015 (including a great meta analysis on "granzyme B" & "perforin" by Heng et al. with quite novel findings), and only 2 & 3 studies from 2014 & 2013, respectively. 4. Several important markers including NGAL and KIM-1 and some of the new markers have not been well reviewed. 5. A systematic review approach is recommended. As an example, authors can see article (PMID: 18094679) by Coca et al.