

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Nephrology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25700

**Title:** Association of blood transfusion with acute kidney injury after transcatheter aortic valve replacement: A meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 03546531

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-03-22 15:20

**Date reviewed:** 2016-03-23 20:19

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		<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

1) Is there any difference in AKI post TAVR with regards to the approach (trans femoral vs trans apical vs trans aortic?) 2) Since at least part of AKI could be explained from aortic thrombus embolization to the renal arteries are there any differences with regards to valve size and AKI?

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Nephrology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25700

**Title:** Association of blood transfusion with acute kidney injury after transcatheter aortic valve replacement: A meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 00503334

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-03-22 15:20

**Date reviewed:** 2016-03-29 02:29

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

n/a