

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS manuscript NO: 24315

Title: Immunofluorescence on paraffin embedded renal biopsies: Experience of a tertiary care center with review of literature

Reviewer's code: 00503282

Reviewer's country: Pakistan

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-01-18 19:47

Date reviewed: 2016-01-29 14:25

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

In this study, authors share their experience of immunofluorescence on formalin-fixed, paraffin-embedded (IF-P) renal biopsy tissue. They attempted IF-P on 246 cases and among these, 32 cases were excluded. In the end, 214 cases were analyzed. These were the case of GN. The authors conclude that IF-P can act as a salvage technique for the demonstration of immunoreactants in paraffin-embedded renal biopsies. However, there are potential caveats. The results are interesting and useful for renal pathologists in developing world. However, the paper can not be accepted in the present form. There are several major and minor points in the paper, which need correction as under: 1. The authors should explain the rationale for doing this study in the Introduction. Was it done as a pilot project, in parallel with IF-F or what??? Please add a para on this aspect of the study. 2. English language and punctuation needs careful correction throughout the paper. 3. The use of abbreviations is not standardized. Some abbreviations are not fully spelled out, eg. FITC. 4. Give percentage figures in brackets in Table 2 and 3.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS manuscript NO: 24315

Title: Immunofluorescence on paraffin embedded renal biopsies: Experience of a tertiary care center with review of literature

Reviewer's code: 00352969

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-01-18 19:47

Date reviewed: 2016-02-02 12:34

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 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input 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 type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors present an interesting article on immunofluorescence on paraffin embedded renal biopsies. It is hard to see how it is really novel since so much of this has been done already; however, I suppose that seeing this work in their practice setting is a nice. They also provide a decent meta-analysis. I have the following observations: - I felt that the introduction was too brief and really didn't provide enough background. For example, there is only 1 reference in the introduction. I feel that more could be included here. They go on to have a pretty nice discussion, so maybe they could include some of the discussion in the introduction and also expand the introduction? Maybe I'm being too picky. - It seems that some spaces are missing in places in the article. For example, there seem to be words that run together a great deal in the references and also some of the tables. Perhaps this is some sort of issue related to conversion from 1 file type to another. - I realize that they at least partially provide it elsewhere in the paper, but I think that it would be nice if they provided more information regarding their methods in Table 1 (e.g., manufacturer, manufacturer location, titration, etc). I think that this table is nice and may be used as

a reference by laboratories in the future; therefore, if Table 1 stands on its own as "recipe", then it could become a tremendous reference for other laboratories. - I don't fully understand Table 3. It might be nice if they also provide a % of cases that had the given differences (i.e., intensity where the 2 methods were equal, difference of 1+, and difference of 2+). Do these differences pertain to a specific antibody (IgG, IgA, IgM, C3, C1q, etc.)? Alternatively, do these differences pertain to some overall average? - A tally at the bottom of Table 4 might have been nice. For example, how many cases of each diagnosis have been tried? How many studies use each of the different reagents (e.g., pronase, etc.)? This is just a suggestion. - It seems to me that they need to list the definition of some acronyms @ the bottom of Table 4 [as well as other tables]. I personally like tables to stand on their own, but maybe this is just me. - I wish we knew more about how these reagents (enzymes, etc.) work. How do they expose the antigens? How gentle vs. how harsh? It would be nice if we were provided with a guide to this, but I realize that it would be difficult to complete such a comprehensive description. I realize that it would be difficult to do a head-to-head comparison since the tissue would be exhausted. The cost might be prohibitive also. Therefore, maybe the article stands as a nice description as it does now.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS manuscript NO: 24315

Title: Immunofluorescence on paraffin embedded renal biopsies: Experience of a tertiary care center with review of literature

Reviewer's code: 00503242

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-01-18 19:47

Date reviewed: 2016-02-03 02:00

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

The paper of Singh et al shows the possibility to have a good option for IF with formalin fixed paraffin embedded tissue, that could be considered a useful 'salvage' technique in case of non-availability of representative fresh frozen tissue. They shows also the limit to use this technique but as well it can be extremely useful where frozen tissue is not available. The paper needs some language editing.