

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 27987

Title: Psychological perspective of medication adherence in transplantation

Reviewer's code: 03656209

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-06-27 18:54

Date reviewed: 2016-07-20 01:37

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 checked="" 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 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

The authors of the manuscript have explored something that its importance should be in depth analyzed: adherence and mental health in transplantation. The manuscript should undergo a minor English style revision especially in the introduction section. Methods should be trimmed to describe amore concise description of the evaluations. Demographic data such as age and sex should be in the results section. There is no statistical software described for analysis (unless it was done manually). Discussion is brief, results should be compared to similar studies in transplant population, and individual importance of each evaluation is encouraged. Many thanks for letting me review the manuscript

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 27987

Title: Psychological perspective of medication adherence in transplantation

Reviewer's code: 03288946

Reviewer's country: France

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-06-27 18:54

Date reviewed: 2016-07-21 15:58

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 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

The manuscript was also written well. I have minor comments for the authors in the other section. Tables should be improved and the reference style should be in accordance with the journal guideline.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 27987

Title: Psychological perspective of medication adherence in transplantation

Reviewer's code: 03293574

Reviewer's country: Poland

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-06-27 18:54

Date reviewed: 2016-07-22 02:56

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"/> 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

Nice observational study. I would suggest diagrams instead of tables, especially correlations look better in a diagram form.