

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 31499

Title: Living related and living unrelated kidney transplantations: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 00503180

Reviewer's country: Egypt

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-11-23 11:19

Date reviewed: 2016-12-09 22:51

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"/> 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

Dear authors for this interesting meta-analysis, it nice to make nice meticulous English revision as there are a lot of grammar mistakes all over the manuscript. Also , i think that the authors did not include some other important retrospective studies which can enrich their meta-analysis. authors did not mention the degree of HLA match in different studies in their analysis.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 31499

Title: Living related and living unrelated kidney transplantations: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 00503322

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-11-23 11:19

Date reviewed: 2016-12-18 02:12

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input 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	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The systematic review has not included some important studies which have compared the rejection rates and outcomes between living related and unrelated kidney transplants. There are several grammatical and typographical errors. The discussion section does not compare and contrast outcomes of the meta-analysis with

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 31499

Title: Living related and living unrelated kidney transplantations: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 03656215

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-11-23 11:19

Date reviewed: 2016-12-15 03:26

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 manuscript authors performed a meta-analysis to compare related and unrelated living donor kidney transplant outcome. Results indicate a better outcome of kidney transplant from living related donors in the long term. Nevertheless, many issues need to be addressed regarding the search strategy and result report. The following issues should be addressed. In Materials and Methods section, Study identification and data abstraction, the full search strategy is missing and should be added: for each database please specify the search strategy with search terms, synonyms, Boolean operators, number of papers retrieved and the search period. It is necessary to clarify eligibility criteria for study selection (Figure 1 and Results): it is not clear how many studies were excluded because are duplicates (in Figure 1 it seems that almost all studies, 365/376, were excluded because are duplicates, while in Results it is stated that "We excluded 10 of the studies after applying our eligibility criteria to their title and/or abstracts, including exclusion of duplicates. These left 10 studies were included". Please explain, describe criteria for detection of duplicates and report how many studies were excluded for other reasons. A description of contacts with authors, if any, is



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

missing. The “Study presentation” section should be moved in the Result section. Discussion on potential biases, exclusions, quality of the included studies should be added in Discussion section. Figure 1: details on “other sources” are needed, it could be included in Results, Study selection. Table 1 is not complete, many data are missing (N/D): so, results are limited to less than 10 papers for each outcome. Efforts to recover missing data are not explained (i.e. request to the authors). The primary outcome was long term graft survival rate, but only 5 out of 10 selected papers report this data (see Table 1). Data on ethnicity and country are not taken into consideration and should be added.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 31499

Title: Living related and living unrelated kidney transplantations: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 00503339

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-11-23 11:19

Date reviewed: 2016-12-16 02:06

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

You have done an important service in clarifying the Issue being addressed and the importance of the subject to those engaged in performing Human Kidney Transplants. Your review of previous studies is a superb collection of vital publications and should be distributed to all teams currently involved in performing human kidney transplants. Good for You!