Author response to reviewer comments

Reviewer: 1

Comments to the Author

It was a pleasure to read this manuscript. Authors offer a general overview of the current status of lung transplantation in the world supported by the review of the literature. The main emphasis is on the maximizing donor pool to improve the number of LTx and they discuss the time of referral, time of listing, re-transplantation, and role of single lung transplantation. I have following suggestions-

Author Response: Thank you for your kind words regarding our Chapter on candidate selection.

1. Language is too perfect to easy understanding of the medicine readers. Try to replace uncommon words with more commonly used and scientific ones.

Author Response: Thank you for your advice.

2. Authors should discuss a role of EVLP in expanding the donor pool.

Author Response: Thank you for your advice. The role of EVLP in expanding the potential donor pool is included on page 7.

3. While touching all the facets of lung transplantation, a discussion on the marginal organs is necessary. Authors have put some evidence about older donors, but other marginal organ factors like smoking, marijuana, low PO2/FiO2 ratio, infections like meningitis could be discussed.

Author Response: Thank you for your advice. The potential utility of “marginal” organ donors has been extended on page 17 but while we agree this is an important topic, the emphasis of our Chapter is on recipient selection.

Reviewer: 2

Comments to the Author

A very interesting contemporary review on patient selection. I recommend publication.

Author Response: Thank you for your kind words and support.