

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 58647

**Title:** Cirrhotic portal hypertension: From pathophysiology to novel therapeutics

**Reviewer's code:** 03252237

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** PhD

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** England

**Author's Country/Territory:** Australia

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-07-31

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-08-01 13:40

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-08-08 14:44

**Review time:** 7 Days and 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a well written and comprehensive review of the pathophysiology of portal hypertension, with some focus on novel mechanisms and therapies. I have some comments to improve the structure and impact.

### Major

1. The structure should be more logical. I would suggest starting with pathophysiology, then clinical aspects. The section on HVPG should follow pathophysiology. This also applies to the section on RAS. It does not seem appropriate to separate from the main paper and clearly there is relevance.
2. The section on RAS should be shortened as there is less clinical relevance for portal hypertension and more for hepatic fibrosis. Indeed studies have shown agents targeting RAS have variable effects on portal pressure, and should really be avoided in advanced cirrhosis. I believe they should be used even more cautiously than NSBBs in this context.
3. On page 4, last paragraph it is stated that NSBBs are only moderately effective in majority of patients. On page 17 it is mentioned that up to 60% fail to achieve a reduction in HVPG with NSBB. This is in direct conflict with a later section highlighting how carvedilol can be effective in the majority and more effective than propranolol. Consistency should be maintained in this regard.
4. The section in page 5 on HVPG measurements. This should mention the important of at least 3 readings and permanent tracing. There should also be mention that HVPG is a measure of sinusoidal portal hypertension and does not accurately reflect pre-sinusoidal portal hypertension e.g. in early stage PBC.
5. The discussion on hepatorenal syndrome should reference the revised definitions from the ICA: [https://www.journal-of-hepatology.eu/article/S0168-8278\(16\)30618-3/pdf](https://www.journal-of-hepatology.eu/article/S0168-8278(16)30618-3/pdf)
6. Page 16: Sentence "The NSBB, carvedilol, has been shown to be more effective than propranolol in reducing first variceal bleeding" is not correct. There is not trial showing this. The only evidence is that carvedilol is more effective than propranolol in reducing portal pressure, even in propranolol non-responders.

### Minor:

1. The BSG guidelines should also be referenced: DOI: 10.1136/gutjnl-2015-309262
2. Page 16: it would be helpful to mention 6 week mortality after a variceal bleed.
3. Page 18, 3rd paragraph, 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence. At the end "increased intrahepatic..." should be "decrease..."

4. Page 18, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, last sentence: "...double-blind RCT". There are large RCT's in progress in the UK which should be quoted:
  - a. Tripathi D, Hayes PC, Richardson P on behalf of CALIBRE trial collaborative group, et al Study protocol for a randomised controlled trial of carvedilol versus variceal band ligation in primary prevention of variceal bleeding in liver cirrhosis (CALIBRE trial)BMJ Open Gastroenterology 2019;6:e000290. doi: 10.1136/bmjgast-2019-000290
  - b. BOPPP trial: <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT03776955>
5. Page 21. Discussion on statins should mention LIVERHOPE study, highlighting the risk of statins which appears to be dose related: DOI: 10.1016/S2468-1253(19)30320-6