



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hepatology*

Manuscript NO: 82956

Title: Sarcopenia in chronic viral hepatitis: From concept to clinical relevance

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 00006518

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, MHSc, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Chief Doctor, Doctor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Taiwan

Author’s Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-31

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-02 01:43

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-12 09:03

Review time: 10 Days and 7 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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" 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 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. Nice review. 2. Please change 'in this study' to 'in this review' at the final paragraph of the introduction section. 3. Please explain why "phase angle" is a necessary descriptor in searching articles for sarcopenia and chronic viral hepatitis.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hepatology*

Manuscript NO: 82956

Title: Sarcopenia in chronic viral hepatitis: From concept to clinical relevance

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 04025443

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Senior Researcher

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Russia

Author’s Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-31

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-20 13:06

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-21 11:31

Review time: 22 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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" 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

Dear colleagues! I read with interest your mini-review "Sarcopenia in the chronic viral hepatitis: from concept to clinical relevance", that covers an important topic of clinical hepatology that evades the attention of practitioners. The matters you brought up are really actual. I have only a few minor comments. The paper is not organized according to general rules. Normally, the order of sections is as follows: Introduction, aim, methods, results, discussion, conclusions). I feel that the manuscript benefit if the search criteria are placed next after the aim. Please, avoid "skeletal muscle abnormalities" in the aim, as this condition is not certain (may include myodystrophias, but they are not covered in the paper). Is it better to use "skeletal muscles weight", or "lean body weight" instead? In search criteria, the search criteria, the use of "body composition" in combination with HBV and HCV could yield additional number of papers. Eligibility criteria are not sufficiently described, please, add the information about extraction of the information from the abstracts, in case they were informative and data of previously published reviews. The study design and flow chart would be appreciated. The data of 17 papers are provided in the results. It seems that some outcomes, like



**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

osteoporosis/fractures are not related to the condition of interest (viral hepatitis B or C), or associations are not sufficiently reflected. Is it possible to reflect the outcomes of antiviral treatment also? Discussion section is lacking. It seems that the text on page 6-12 may be used to organize this section. Please, avoid the use of references in the Conclusion, as this part of the manuscript should be based on the results of your search and your analysis of the information. I hope that my comments help you to improve your manuscript