

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Transplantation

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 24434

**Title:** Long term outcomes of cardiac transplant for amyloidosis amyloidosis: The mayo clinic experience

**Reviewer's code:** 01196501

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-01-27 16:53

**Date reviewed:** 2016-01-28 09:52

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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	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

In this paper, authors give some new information about long term survival after heart transplant. However, there are some questions to solve as follows: 1. Key words in abstract are loss. 2. format is not standardized following the World Journal of Transplantation.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Transplantation

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 24434

**Title:** Long term outcomes of cardiac transplant for amyloidosis amyloidosis: The mayo clinic experience

**Reviewer's code:** 00227470

**Reviewer's country:** Netherlands

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-01-27 16:53

**Date reviewed:** 2016-01-28 17:19

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"/> 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

The authors presented a good overview of patients with AL amyloidosis + advanced heart failure who received cardiac transplantation. My only suggestion would be to add a study flow chart to the figures demonstrating patient selection (starting with 3117 amyloidosis patients, of whom 23 were transplanted).