

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 24204

**Title:** Cavitory lung lesion 6 years after renal transplantation

**Reviewer's code:** 00503279

**Reviewer's country:** Qatar

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-01-15 13:30

**Date reviewed:** 2016-01-24 01:52

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 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 checked="" 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	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This case report discusses an important issue in patients with kidney transplantation. The manuscript needs strongly to be reviewed by an English speaking editor since there are many typing errors and some grammatical defects.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 24204

**Title:** Cavitory lung lesion 6 years after renal transplantation

**Reviewer's code:** 00503185

**Reviewer's country:** Egypt

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-01-15 13:30

**Date reviewed:** 2016-01-27 00:49

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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 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

Dear Professor: Regarding the case report: Cavitory lung lesion 6 years after renal transplantation. It deserves publication after correcting statement in page 3 (revealed pancytopenia(Hb-7.4g/dl, total leucocyte count-3400/cu mm, platelet count-247000/cu mm)) because there is no pancytopenia (platelets are normal in count) Best Wishes Hussein Sheashaa

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 24204

**Title:** Cavitory lung lesion 6 years after renal transplantation

**Reviewer's code:** 00505624

**Reviewer's country:** Egypt

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-01-15 13:30

**Date reviewed:** 2016-01-26 15:51

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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 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

Well written case report