

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Advances in Nephrology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJANR_108729
Title of the Manuscript:	Clinical significance of protocol allograft renal biopsy in a tertiary care centre in India.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes it is. But, a priori, the small sample could be less interesting.</p> <p>2. Yes, it is.</p> <p>3. The data in this section is not aligned with the data in the manuscript.</p> <p>4. Yes, it is.</p> <p>5. No, I do not think it.</p> <p>6. Yes, they are.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes, it is.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Comments on Clinical significance of protocol allograft renal biopsy in a tertiary care centre in India.</p> <p>Introduction Well written, it gives a clear context for the following sections.</p> <p>Aim To describe a local experience about a "protocol biopsy" in kidney transplant recipients. It is in line with the manuscript's title. The second objective is to describe a multivariate analysis of factors potentially related to "protocol biopsy abnormalities".</p> <p>Methods: Sample: "Stable graft function at one month were eligible for inclusion". Why were discarded those patients with abnormal kidney function at first month? In fact, the abnormalities could signify an acute rejection. If patients could be biopsied because any abnormality, the biopsy is not protocol related. This issue could be of special interest because it can allow to establish relationships between protocol biopsy findings al further allograft abnormalities. In this section it is stated that "The primary study endpoint was a 6-month serum creatinine value and urine examination for proteinuria", but in the title and methods section is stated that the aim is the protocol biopsy findings themselves, neither the 6 month kidney function nor the proteinuria Flow chart: I do not understand the figures in the right sided box. The numbers are "strange". There is a discordance between the secondary aim (age, gender, basic disease, donor characteristics like age, sex, glomerular filtration rate, relationship, HLA mismatch, induction therapy, type of maintenance immunosuppression, drug level of the calcineurin inhibitor used) and the intended statistical analysis to be carry on (donor age, HLA mismatches, mycophenolate mofetil</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>(MMF) use and protocol biopsy on outcome measures).</p> <p>Results Table 1: In methods section was stated that the sample were 48 patients, but in this table the real number is higher than 48. But, at the same time, living + cadaveric donors sum 27 instead of 48 patients. In just 30 of 48 patients indeed a protocol biopsy was performed at month 1. Were only these ones those give origin to the protocol biopsy findings? From these 30 patients, 27 had normal biopsy findings and 3 showed some kind of acute rejection, were these three biopsies indeed "protocol biopsies"? Two of the three rejections were expected to have abnormal allograft function. Where is the multivariate analysis?</p> <p>Discussion First paragraph: What about the ABMR?</p>	
--	--	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fernando González Fuenzalida
Department, University & Country	Hospital del Salvador, Universidad de Chile, Chile