

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 30391

**Title:** Smoking In Renal Transplantation; Facts Beyond Myth

**Reviewer's code:** 03674930

**Reviewer's country:** Taiwan

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-10-10 13:46

**Date reviewed:** 2016-11-17 15:56

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 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"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> 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 address many of these concerns using certain statistical approaches but do not explain why these methods would be better compared to other methods that have been used in similar metaanalyses. Overall the study lacks novelty since this question has been previously addressed but it is still a useful contribution and summary of available studies. Tables comparing the current metaanalysis with similar prior reviews on this topic and other metaanalyses would be useful. Especially regarding the limitations of the current methods. The discussion should be tailored more on the statistical limitations rather a true negative biological effect of smoking.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 30391

**Title:** Smoking In Renal Transplantation; Facts Beyond Myth

**Reviewer's code:** 00842450

**Reviewer's country:** United Kingdom

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-10-10 13:46

**Date reviewed:** 2016-11-17 16:27

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 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"/> 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

This concise review is well written. I recommend this review for acceptance.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 30391

**Title:** Smoking In Renal Transplantation; Facts Beyond Myth

**Reviewer's code:** 03368612

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-10-10 13:46

**Date reviewed:** 2016-11-02 04:35

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

Thank you for allowing me to review this review article on smoking in the setting of renal transplantation. It is a very nice review of the clinical studies highlighting the deleterious effects of smoking on the transplant kidney and recipients themselves. I think it is suitable for publication with a few suggestions for improvement. 1. There are minor typographical or grammatical errors which should be corrected. 2. Please add a summary paragraph at the end of the manuscript to tie together the conclusion 3. It is unfortunately beyond the control of the kidney transplant recipient to have never smoked in the past or not. I would prefer to not say in the third bullet point of the conclusion that "it is wiser to not smoke from the start". Probably that bullet can just end after the word "survival".