

Reviewer#1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: This manuscript reviewed the recent advance about using cfDNA as biomarkers for monitoring kidney transplant rejection. The value of the manuscript was apparent. The authors should pay attention on the following points. 1. The manuscript needed revision on grammar mistakes e.g. "Monitoring of kidney transplant for rejection conventionally include....." should be "Monitoring of kidney transplant for rejection conventionally includes.....". 2. Transplantation rejections can be classified as host versus graft reaction and graft versus host reaction. Whether the use of dd-cfDNA was different between the two kinds of reactions? 3. cfDNA can be released by intact organs. cfDNA is synthesized by intact organs. Acute rejection might destroy the transplants. This might cause the over releasing of dd-cfDNA. It might also cause the dysfunction of cfDNA synthesis and in turn the limited releasing of dd-cfDNA. The authors should add some words on how to deal with the paradox.

Response:

1. We thank the reviewer for the comments. We have now addressed grammatical errors in the revision.
2. Host versus graft and graft versus host reactions are generally seen in bone marrow transplant recipients and extremely rare following kidney transplantation. There is no current literature available regarding cell free DNA use in such scenarios.
3. We have now addressed comment #3 by showing that a previously failed kidney transplant does not have significant impact on cell free DNA levels (please see page 11, last 4 lines)

4 LANGUAGE QUALITY

Please resolve all language issues in the manuscript based on the peer review report. Please be sure to have a native-English speaker edit the manuscript for grammar, sentence structure, word usage, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, format, and general readability, so that the manuscript's language will meet our direct publishing needs.

Response: All language issues are resolved

5 EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS

Authors must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which are listed below:

- (1) Science editor: 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a minireview of the emerging role of cell free DNA in kidney transplantation. The topic is within the scope of the WJEM. (1) Classification: Grade C; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: This manuscript reviewed the recent advance about using cfDNA as biomarkers for monitoring kidney transplant rejection. The value of the manuscript was apparent. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; (3) Format: There are 2 tables; (4) References: A total of 69 references are cited, including 21 references published in the last 3 years; (5) Self-cited references: There are 2 self-cited references. The self-referencing rates should be less than 10%. Please keep the reasonable self-citations (i.e. those that are most closely related to the topic of the manuscript) and remove all other improper self-citations. If the authors fail to address the critical issue of self-citation, the editing process of this manuscript will be terminated; and (6) References recommendations: The authors have the right to refuse to cite improper references recommended by the peer reviewer(s), especially references published by the peer reviewer(s) him/herself (themselves). If the authors find the peer reviewer(s) request for the authors to cite improper references published by him/herself (themselves), please send the peer reviewer's ID number to editorialoffice@wjgnet.com. The Editorial Office will close and remove the peer reviewer from the F6Publishing system immediately. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade C. 3 Academic norms and rules: No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. No financial support was obtained for the study. The topic has not previously been published in the WJEM. 5 Issues raised: (1) PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. 6 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

Response: We have now added PMID and DOI numbers for references.

- (2) Company editor-in-chief: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Experimental Medicine, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have

sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.

Response: Thank you