

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 34923

Title: Treatment of autoimmune hepatitis: a systematic review

Reviewer's code: 01551432

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2017-06-07

Date reviewed: 2017-06-09

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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 system is imcomplete PLease check the system Time in money

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 34923

Title: Treatment of autoimmune hepatitis: a systematic review

Reviewer's code: 03700188

Reviewer's country: Brazil

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2017-06-07

Date reviewed: 2017-06-14

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"/> 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

This is a well written review with current information and will be very useful for bringing the information in a clear and systematic way for clinical use.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 34923

Title: Treatment of autoimmune hepatitis: a systematic review

Reviewer's code: 00503430

Reviewer's country: Iran

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2017-06-07

Date reviewed: 2017-06-16

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 checked="" 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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		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 is a very good and updated review on this challenging issue. The methodology of the review should be addressed before acceptance.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 34923

Title: Treatment of autoimmune hepatitis: a systematic review

Reviewer's code: 00158779

Reviewer's country: Germany

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2017-06-07

Date reviewed: 2017-06-17

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

Beretta-Piccoli et al. present a very informative and updated review on the treatment of autoimmune hepatitis. There are few recommendations: Page 5 line 20: than Page 7: I would not recommend starting with Aza 0.5 mg/kg/d in children. Normally we use 2-(3) mg/kg/d and reduce subsequently. Please discuss it again with the authors of ref. 13 (who are the same as in this paper). Page 7: 5th last line: a more recent: a word is missing (e.g. publication) 4.3. Side effects: acne should additionally be mentioned as a side effect of steroids and pancreatitis in the azathioprine section. 5. Budenoside, last paragraph: the sub-analysis of ref 68 showed really a bad result, with a significant lower response than in patients with conventional treatment. You should mention that with some extra words before your conclusion, not to recommend, which I support univocally. Cyclosporin: It is not that severe with side effects if you consider appropriate target levels, which should range between 70-100 ng/ml. Please mention that as you did for tacrolimus. 7. Liver transplantation: It would be interesting for the reader to learn which proportion of long-term treated patients eventually have to undergo liver



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

transplantation.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 34923

Title: Treatment of autoimmune hepatitis: a systematic review

Reviewer's code: 01567543

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2017-06-07

Date reviewed: 2017-06-20

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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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

Major points: 1. The article states this is a systematic review. However, the manuscript lacks a clear search strategy of any kind or even a methods section. If this paper is proposed as a systematic review, it should be presented as such: with a clear research question and search strategy. In that case the reader can assess the quality of the work. It seems to me that the authors have two choices: either alter the structure of the manuscript into a systematic review (according to PRISMA-statement) or remove 'systematic' from the title and present it as a 'narrative' review. Our preference is to write it up as a systematic review. 2. The manuscript is very lengthy. It has the risk that the reader loses his or her attention. It should be shortened before considered for publication to improve readability. Suggestions for shortening are: - Introduction: a lot of text is attributed to introduction of the disease whether the article is about treatment of the disease - 4. Standard treatment: the text on page 4-5 on the history of PRED/AZA in AIH is quite lengthy and should be shortened. - 6. Alternative treatments: the manuscript covers no less than 11 alternative treatments that are extensively covered.

One could however argue that some of the treatments could be scrapped or described in a more brief manner. For example: a whole paragraph (page 13) is dedicated to sirolimus and yet the authors conclude in that paragraph that the data on sirolimus in AIH are 'scanty and disappointing'. We propose the following categories/subheadings for alternative treatments: - MMF - Calcineurin inhibitors (tacrolimus + cyclosporine) - Biologicals (rituximab + infliximab) - Thiopurines (6-MP/6-TG/allupurinol) - Other. Also, the paragraph on liver transplantation should be considered for removal since the paragraph is quite short and does not rightfully address all issues concerning liver transplantation in AIH. Also, the scope of the article is more on pharmacological treatment rather than liver transplantation. 3. Aim / focus. The information and evidence of all treatment aspects of AIH is quite correct. However, it would suit the article to have a more clear focus. Firstly, an important point here is whether the article should focus on treatment of AIH in adults or children. Evidence / text on treatment of adults and children is now mixed together which makes it look messy. The authors should make a choice whether to steer this article towards treatment of AIH in children or adults, not both. Secondly, in contrast to just summarize all the evidence out there on various treatments, the article misses a clear aim. This is consistent with the point I made earlier about the 'systematic' part of this review. If the authors propose a clear aim with consistent method, the aim and scope of this article will be of better quality. The authors are encouraged to think of a clear direction of the article and write the manuscript in that manner. 4. Conclusion paragraph. This section should be re-written or changed to a 'discussion' paragraph. It now summarizes the main points covered in the article. Also, when the authors take into account our comments about aim and focus, a discussion/conclusion section could be used to elaborate on the current issues with treatment of AIH, shortcomings of available evidence and a proposed research agenda for new treatments (just an example).