



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

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 26847

Title: Physical rehabilitation for lung transplant candidates and recipients: An evidence-informed clinical approach

Reviewer's code: 00068723

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-04-28 17:01

Date reviewed: 2016-04-29 04:51

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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 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

This review presents physical rehabilitation for candidates and recipients of lung transplantation. Potential patients range from infants to adults. The readers would obtain practical information. Especially, pretransplant rehabilitation is useful. This part would be potentially applicable to other field of clinical practice. The structure of the manuscript is well-organized.



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 26847

Title: Physical rehabilitation for lung transplant candidates and recipients: An evidence-informed clinical approach

Reviewer’s code: 02493709

Reviewer’s country: Romania

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-04-28 17:01

Date reviewed: 2016-05-24 12:13

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"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" 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

Dear authors, I congratulate you for this very interesting synthesis of the literature regarding physical rehabilitation of lung transplant candidates and recipients. It is interesting and has many strong points. However, there are some problems with the structure of this review, that should be corrected before being considered for publication: - I am not sure what the evidence-informed clinical approach is, and how it relates to this article. The article is written more like a course or as a book chapter - specific information, correlation with clinical studies, objective information is in general lacking. For example, the authors state that: Short tests of physical performance and mobility might better capture changes in muscle strength than the 6MWT, and may be a useful addition to a regular functional assessment in the pre-transplant phase. How did they reach this conclusions? | From their own experience? From a clinical study? No hints are given by the article. This problem repeats itself all over the article. - from where are taken the tables? Are they original? If so, how was the information synthetised? There are numerous parts of the tables without any references, that should be present in a proper scientific review. - without a proper correlation with the scientific



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>

literature, I find very hard to follow the information, and especially to check it for consistency. The authors only use references to support partially their statements. For example: The 6MWT is reassessed regularly post-transplant,⁵ to monitor changes in exercise capacity and exertional oxygen saturation, which may change over time particularly in cases of chronic rejection. Although the majority of exercise training programs occur in the first three to four months following transplant, longer-term exercise training may provide additional benefits. Here, they support by a reference the first statement from the first phrase. However, in the next sentences there are some pretty specific information that are not supported by references, and they should - who said that oxygen saturation changes over time, especially in patients with chronic rejection? Who said that longer term exercise training can provide additional benefits? This issues plague the whole article, and should be corrected in all their occurrences, not only in the above-mentioned places - there are some grammar and spelling errors - see centres from the second paragraph in the introduction (it should be centers, repeated in other parts), or plantarflexors - should be plantar flexors



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

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 26847

Title: Physical rehabilitation for lung transplant candidates and recipients: An evidence-informed clinical approach

Reviewer's code: 00502799

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-04-28 17:01

Date reviewed: 2016-05-25 23:29

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"/> [Y] 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"/> 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

Dear Authors, I am glad having the opportunity of reviewing the manuscript 26847, 'PHYSICAL REHABILITATION FOR LUNG TRANSPLANT CANDIDATES AND RECIPIENTS: AN EVIDENCE INFORMED CLINICAL APPROACH'. The paper is of high quality and interesting and provides indeed a practical approach to rehabilitation based on clinical practice and research.