

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 21811

Title: Proteomics for rejection diagnosis in renal transplant patients: Where are we now?

Reviewer's code: 00465176

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-08-15 08:02

Date reviewed: 2015-08-29 14:07

| 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 checked="" 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

This review focuses on an interesting and important topic. However is too long and often lacks focus. There is too much text in the first sections that are not directly relevant to the topic. For example the pathogenesis of rejection can be summarized in a figure rather than a whole text section. There are no specific references for each sentence. Sections I-III can be significantly abbreviated/omitted so that the focus is on section IV. They can also be substituted by figures and tables. In section IV the tables have a lot of info but there is limited synthesis and interpretation of data. There is just a list of proteins and abbreviations but there is no mention of the role of these proteins and how they correlate to the pathogenesis of rejection. Again a figure summarizing the major proteins based on the best evidence and how they are involved in the inflammatory pathways of rejection would increase clarity and the impact of paper. The discussion on the most important section of the paper (IV) is limited with few references and limited interpretation. The manuscript should be shortened appropriately.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 21811

Title: Proteomics for rejection diagnosis in renal transplant patients: Where are we now?

Reviewer's code: 00504647

Reviewer's country: Poland

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-08-15 08:02

Date reviewed: 2015-09-02 04:46

| 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"/> 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 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

This paper reviews the different proteomic approaches and summarizes results from studies that examined proteomic for diagnosing rejection. It is very well and clearly written.