

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 26769

Title: Deceased organ donation for transplantation: Challenges and opportunities

Reviewer's code: 00054369

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-04-26 16:34

Date reviewed: 2016-05-06 22:54

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 checked="" 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

Nice and comprehensive review of status of organ donation in the United States. It is in a good format but you might be able to make the manuscript shorter by deleting sections that are being repeated in the text. You repeat yourself in the text on many occasions and on many subjects

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 26769

Title: Deceased organ donation for transplantation: Challenges and opportunities

Reviewer's code: 00504150

Reviewer's country: Canada

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-04-26 16:34

Date reviewed: 2016-05-18 22:11

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input 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 checked="" 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

I read, with interest, the manuscript entitled, "Deceased organ donation for transplantation: challenges and opportunities" by Girlanda. This is a very nice review of clinical issues associated with organ donation. My major comment is that when I read this paper I was hoping to have the answer to increasing of donor pool. The author pointed out three opportunities to increase deceased organ donors: 1) The imminent death, 2) The donor's family, 3) CPR for organs. However, we all have been trying to increase donors utilizing such strategies. Given the insufficient number of deceased donor organs to address the needs of patients waiting transplantation, evidence in support of specific changes to policy/practice that may improve donation rates and utilization rates would be valuable. Specific points 1) What is the source of Figure 1? The author should clearly indicate the source of data and, if applicable, should get permission from the data owner. 2) I do not think Figures 2 and 3 are useful. Likewise Tables 1, 2, and 3 are not necessary. 3) In the subsection "The imminent death", the author state, "...and death before organ recovery, ...". This does not make sense. Donor has to be dead before organ recovery.