



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Transplantation

**Manuscript NO:** 47083

**Title:** Histological and clinical evaluation of marginal donor kidneys before transplantation: which is best?

**Reviewer's code:** 00504341

**Reviewer's country:** France

**Science editor:** Jin-Lei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-03-08 07:46

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-03-09 09:34

**Review time:** 1 Day and 1 Hour

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This very complete revision of the subject "Histological and clinical evaluation of marginal donor kidneys before transplantation: which is best?" by Maurizio Salvadori et al. highlights the most important points mentioned by different authors who have



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://www.wjgnet.com**

actively worked in the subject. The conclusions of this manuscript reflect the most important concepts with regard to this problem. Nevertheless, I believe that this work does not provide new elements of interest for readers.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Transplantation

**Manuscript NO:** 47083

**Title:** Histological and clinical evaluation of marginal donor kidneys before transplantation: which is best?

**Reviewer's code:** 02726701

**Reviewer's country:** Chile

**Science editor:** Jin-Lei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-03-09 19:49

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-03-09 21:25

**Review time:** 1 Hour

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Comments on Histological and clinical evaluation of marginal donor kidneys before transplantation: which is best? Introduction Figure 1: I suggest to add the procurement process as a factor that also influences the post-transplant outcomes. Regarding time



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

zero biopsies and the low kappa coefficient in scoring histological abnormalities by non-renal pathologists, the same could be argued to a possibility that even renal pathologist could not agree in the analysis of those biopsies. Is it possible to comment that issue? In the conclusion section, please, comment: 1. The difficulty of obtaining adequate histological analysis of pre transplantation biopsies and the risk/benefit considerations to prolong cold ischemia time waiting for chronic histological abnormalities that, at the end of the day, show poor correlation with clinical outcomes. 2. How many centers around the world have indeed implemented the use of any of the described prognostic scoring systems to allocate their organs? Especially in those centers where the scoring systems were developed. 3. Is any of these scoring systems used where authors develop their clinical practice? 4. As the predictive value of the majority of these scoring system is poor. Do you think that they are really useful for clinical practice? In conclusion. The manuscript is very good, it covers almost all the literature related to the evaluation of extended criteria non-living donors for kidney transplantation. Nevertheless, I would like some personal conclusions, based in their reflection of the revisited literature, about: The manuscript title: Histological or Clinical evaluation, which is best? To implement or not some kind of pre implantation evaluation and the consequences of discarding inappropriately non as bad kidneys.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### *Google Search:*

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



# Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

*BPG Search:*

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Transplantation

**Manuscript NO:** 47083

**Title:** Histological and clinical evaluation of marginal donor kidneys before transplantation: which is best?

**Reviewer’s code:** 03742333

**Reviewer’s country:** United Kingdom

**Science editor:** Jin-Lei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-03-08 07:27

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-03-10 09:55

**Review time:** 2 Days and 2 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

I have read with great interest the manuscript entitled ‘Histological and clinical evaluation of marginal donor kidneys before transplantation: which is best?’. In this narrative review the authors discuss the scientific evidence available for the relevance of



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

several histological and clinical scores to evaluate donor kidneys prior to transplantation. The manuscript focusses specifically on marginal or extended criteria donor (ECD) organs. The manuscript is well written, and the limitations of the studies included are somehow acknowledged, nonetheless, there are some points that deserve attention and once amended may improve the quality of this review article. MAJOR COMMENTS: 1- Limitations related to study design are not commented in the manuscript. This is a narrative review, therefore, there is no strict selection criteria for inclusion of articles and the design of the studies included are not reported. This may potentially create a selection bias as well as include information from small cohort studies where the rigour of a controlled randomised trial was lacking. 2- Machine perfusion (MP) of donor kidneys is currently widely used, even in clinical practice, and viability criteria as well as functional biomarkers during MP have been extensively investigated, thereby, a slightly deeper discussion on this topic is required. In addition, the inclusion of this discussion is relevant once that several limitations of histological and clinical evaluation of ECD donor kidneys are acknowledged in the conclusion. 3- Regarding omics examination to generate biomarkers, I was wondering if there is any possible molecule in investigation thus far? In case there is more than one, any specific biomarker seems promising? A deeper discussion on this topic would improve the manuscript. In the current format, it extensively discusses several scores but does not explore future perspective in detail.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### *Google Search:*

- [ ] The same title
- [ ] Duplicate publication
- [ ] Plagiarism
- [ Y ] No



# Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

***BPG Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No





**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Transplantation

**Manuscript NO:** 47083

**Title:** Histological and clinical evaluation of marginal donor kidneys before transplantation: which is best?

**Reviewer’s code:** 00505314

**Reviewer’s country:** United States

**Science editor:** Jin-Lei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-03-12 17:22

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-03-12 18:11

**Review time:** 1 Hour

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

In this review article, the authors describe the utility of clinical parameters, procurement biopsy, and different scoring systems that were developed over the years in order to aid the clinician to decide whether to accept or discard a marginal deceased donor kidney.



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

Future directions are also discussed. Overall, this is a very exhaustive and informative review useful for the readership. Would replace the term cadaveric donor with deceased donor throughout the text. Also would change "non-heart beating donor" with the term "donation after cardiac death donor"

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Transplantation

**Manuscript NO:** 47083

**Title:** Histological and clinical evaluation of marginal donor kidneys before transplantation: which is best?

**Reviewer’s code:** 00054120

**Reviewer’s country:** United States

**Science editor:** Jin-Lei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-03-08 13:22

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-03-13 13:09

**Review time:** 4 Days and 23 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Thank you for submitting your review paper to the World Journal of Transplantation, it is very interesting review that will be of value to the readers who work in the field of renal transplantation. I have few comments and suggestions that may be of interest to



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

the readers; 1- can you elaborate on your experience working in transplant center and what protocol or practice guidelines that your center applies regarding the decision to use or not to use a kidney? 2- From your extensive review of the literature regarding this topic, can you elaborate on your personal view and may be your personal recommendations for the readers. Although, you stated in your conclusion few possibilities for the future advancement in the universal practice guidelines to ensure more accurate selection process, however, knowing your personal conclusion after reviewing all these articles and your experience working in renal transplant center may give more value to the purpose of the review. Regards

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Transplantation

**Manuscript NO:** 47083

**Title:** Histological and clinical evaluation of marginal donor kidneys before transplantation: which is best?

**Reviewer's code:** 03291363

**Reviewer's country:** Australia

**Science editor:** Jin-Lei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-03-09 05:45

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-04-02 01:32

**Review time:** 23 Days and 19 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The authors have entitled their paper about marginal donors but then proceed to assess the quality of all deceased donor kidneys and their allocation. So I am confused about what they actually want to review: is it ECD kidneys or the all donor kidneys? The



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

review leaves me asking this question: what is the best practice method for assessing donor kidneys? Further how can this be improved: what studies need to be done and why? There is mention of many small studies that will carry risks of type 2 errors. This needs to be addressed. The paper would benefit from a more analytical approach leading to a set of conclusions about what can be accepted now and what should be done and how can this be done to improve the quality assessment. A medical editor is required for this manuscript.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No