

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 68196

Title: Abnormal liver enzymes: A review for clinicians

Reviewer's code: 03475470

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Academic Research, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-15

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-05-15 12:24

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-19 07:07

Review time: 3 Days and 18 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish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



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a concise summary of liver biochemical tests which is very useful for medical students but not so much for hepatologist. To be more informative, the authors may add the following content: (1) discuss the challenge of current upper limit of normal (ULN) of serum ALT and AST levels for detecting chronic liver disease and the proposed new thresholds; (2) discuss the significance of laboratory parameters in the liver biochemical tests in stratifying risk of unfavorable outcome such as significant fibrosis, cirrhosis, HCC and death;

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 68196

Title: Abnormal liver enzymes: A review for clinicians

Reviewer's code: 05965419

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-15

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-05-20 23:48

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-24 00:46

Review time: 3 Days

Scientific quality	<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
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

Liver function tests (LFTs) are commonly ordered routine tests and the results provide lots of information for the clinicians to make further decision for either treatment or referral. The authors first introduced the contents and characteristics of each item in the LFT, then explained the pattern and interpretation of abnormalities in LFTs. Importantly, the authors depicted the typical pattern of LFTs to differentiate NAFLD/NASH, viral hepatitis, inherited metabolic liver diseases, autoimmune hepatitis, DILI, etc. The manuscript is well prepared and written. I only have a few minor suggestions. 1, p4, lines 28-29, "The normal range for ALT in males between 29-33 IU/L and 19-25 IU/L for females" should be the normal range adopted in the USA. Other countries/regions use different normal range. Please specify this point. 2, p6, lines 23-25, "The liver is involved in the synthesis of multiple clotting factors including, factors I, II, V, VII, IX, X, XI, and XIII. In addition to protein C, protein S, and anti-thrombin." Did the authors add an unnecessary full stop before "In addition to" (do the authors mean that all the factors mentioned above are synthesized by liver?) 3, p8, lines 21-22, "GGT x2 the ULN is suggestive of alcohol abuse specifically when paired with AST: ALT > 2". What do the authors mean by saying "GGT x2 the ULN"? Do they mean that GGT >2 xULN? 4, p11, paragraph 1, if the authors could add some information about the LFT pattern in acute/chronic hepatitis E, that will be awesome. 5, p12, line 16, "AST: ALT > 2.2, and ALP: Bilirubin < 4": I don't understand the calculation here. When the authors say AST:ALT, do they use the direct measurement of AST and ALT to calculate the ratio of AST/ALT, or instead they calculate the (AST/ULN)/(ALT/ULN)? And for the statement of ALP: bilirubin < 4, I feel even more confused. The measurement unit of ALP is IU/L, while the unit of bilirubin is mg/dl. How can these 2 parameters be calculated like this? Or do the authors still mean that they are using the ALP/ULN to be divided by bilirubin/ULN? And what is the rationale to make this calculation? 6, p13, line 26, "ALP:

AST/ALT < 3", similar comment as in #5, are they calculating the ratio of (ALP/ULN)/[(AST/ULN)/(ALT/ULN)]? And there are 2 division symbols (: and /), what is the calculation order? Do they first divide AST by ALT, then divide ALP by the ratio of AST/ALT? If this is the case, then it should be presented as ALP : (AST/ALT). I have an example here: A subject who was autoimmune hepatitis (decompensated) had a LFT result as follows: ALT=87 (ULN 64), AST=213 (ULN 40), ALP=172 (ULN 126). The result is way too much different by the 2 calculation methods. Please clarify this. 1) ALP: (AST/ALT)=172:(213/87)=70.26 2) ALP/ULN:((AST/ULN)/(ALT/ULN))=(172/126):[(213/40)/(87/64)]=0.35

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 68196

Title: Abnormal liver enzymes: A review for clinicians

Reviewer's code: 03714112

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Consultant Physician-Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-15

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-05-15 09:33

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-27 13:47

Review time: 12 Days and 4 Hours

Scientific quality	<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
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

GENERAL COMMENT The Authors performed an interesting and well-written review on LFTs. Some comments may be raised at improving the quality of the manuscript.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS - The Authors may mean NAFL instead of NALFD when they state: “NAFLD and Nonalcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH) are diseases in the same spectrum where NAFLD can progress to NASH and subsequently liver cirrhosis if no intervention or modification of risk factors was done.....”. “The difference between the two is primarily seen on histology as NAFLD has only fatty infiltration without inflammation whereas NASH has marked inflammation.” - Liver function tests have been combined in specific scores for assessing liver fibrosis (serum biomarkers of liver fibrosis such as NFL, HFS, FIB-4...). Although serum biomarkers of liver fibrosis perform much better to exclude advanced fibrosis rather than to identify it, they may be useful to select patients for further assessment of liver fibrosis by transient elastography or liver biopsy in selected cases (Loomba R, Gut. 2020 Jul;69(7):1343-1352.). In addition, serum biomarkers of liver fibrosis are also correlated with cardiovascular risk scores therefore allowing the stratification of both hepatological and cardio-metabolic risks (Ballestri S, et al. Diagnostics (Basel). 2021 Jan 9;11(1):98.). Please comment and update literature. - The need to lower the cut-off of aminotransferases has long been suggested (Prati D, Ann Intern Med. 2002 Jul 2;137(1):1-10.). Please comment.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 68196

Title: Abnormal liver enzymes: A review for clinicians

Reviewer's code: 05913050

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Mexico

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-15

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-05-17 15:59

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-28 00:23

Review time: 10 Days and 8 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

1. In line 60, Keywords: Words no abbreviations "LFT" 2. In line 61: Hyperbilirubinemia, with capital letter, and I between b and n. 3. In line 76: Without space between study_ of 4. In line 80: with space next to "unexplained" 5. In line 148: to use "U" instead of "units" 6. In line 160: The correct unit is "g/dL" instead to "g/dl" 7. In line 338: to put "Pi*ZZ" genotype or "Pi*Z" mutation don't "PI*ZZ mutation" In the abstract they only mention to aminotransferases, I suggest incorp other enzymes since the title mentioned "liver enzymes" or to incorporate Liver biochemical tests in the title with above observation on the abstract. It is correct a space before number reference? In line 99: describe: What are the enzymes, Markers of liver synthetic function, etc. to follow coherent way the next paragraphs In the table 1: title, doesn't describe their content. For example, interpretation, site and function of Liver biochemical studies. In table 2: needs a description title of the table. For example: Interpretation of..... R-value In table 3: "Common condition with abnormal liver biochemical tests" in the title is repeated in the table. In table 4: Title in each column is needed and abbreviations at the foot of the table. Verify similar format in tables

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 68196

Title: Abnormal liver enzymes: A review for clinicians

Reviewer's code: 05863678

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Nepal

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-15

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-05-20 12:01

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-28 09:27

Review time: 7 Days and 21 Hours

Scientific quality	<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
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

Overall, i would like to congratulate the whole team for great effort to bring this manuscript. I feel that some recent advances scientific study should be included in the study. Also i have some points made in the manuscript. please kindly find it. also the limitation of these tests should be mentioned.