

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS manuscript NO: 24147

Title: Renal biopsy: Still a landmark for the nephrologist

Reviewer's code: 00503252

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-01-13 08:23

Date reviewed: 2016-01-20 05:42

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 checked="" 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 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

Visconti L et al. reported comprehensive review in renal biopsy. This reviewer has some minor comments. 1. The authors stated that "in 2011 Lane et al showed that radiologists were the main performers of this technique (figure 1) [9-10]" (P4, L4-5). Is this universal? In my country in Asia radiologists rarely perform needle renal biopsy. 2. The authors described that "(EM) (fixed in 2-3% glutaraldehyde or 1-4% paraformaldehyde)" (P4, L4 from last line). I do not think that 1% paraformaldehyde is enough to fix the renal specimens well for EM. Confirm this and cite reference for this. 3. The statement "The treatment of symptomatic cases is based on superselective transcatheter arterial embolization or, in rare cases, surgery." (P6. L6-7 from the last line) needs appropriated references.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS manuscript NO: 24147

Title: Renal biopsy: Still a landmark for the nephrologist

Reviewer's code: 00503255

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-01-13 08:23

Date reviewed: 2016-01-22 13:49

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	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This review paper is well-written and provides comprehensive information about renal biopsy practice. Some points should be revised. 1. It may be better to add the section of indication for kidney biopsy. 2. page 6, line 22-24: Reference no. 17 did not show the content describe here. Dr. Haars suggested that routine use of EM to evaluate renal biopsy is not wasteful or frivolous and recommended that renal tissue for EM be set aside in each case if EM cannot be performed routinely. 3. page 6, line 25: "LM e IF" What does it mean? 4. page 10, the section of "Alternative approaches for the renal biopsy: Open kidney biopsy should be added to this section. 5. page 11, line 11-13: What does it mean? There is a grammatical error. Please revised this sentence.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS manuscript NO: 24147

Title: Renal biopsy: Still a landmark for the nephrologist

Reviewer's code: 00503294

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-01-13 08:23

Date reviewed: 2016-01-26 18:51

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] 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 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

This is a review article. It is well written and provides comprehensive information about renal biopsy practice. Moreover it provides general information regarding the historical evolution of the procedure, side effects as well as alternative diagnostic technics. Minor concerns: The authors have to review the grammar as well as the references section

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS manuscript NO: 24147

Title: Renal biopsy: Still a landmark for the nephrologist

Reviewer's code: 00504647

Reviewer's country: Poland

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-01-13 08:23

Date reviewed: 2016-02-15 02:40

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"/> 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 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

This is very well written review. My criticism is as follows: Management of post-biopsy complications should be covered more extensively especially pharmacological treatment even off-label drug use (i.e. recombinant activated factor VII). Radiologists usually perform renal biopsy in USA whereas in Europe over 80% of biopsies are done by nephrologists