

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Transplantation*

Manuscript NO: 85393

Title: Delayed referral liver transplant evaluation is associated with worse outcomes in patients with chronic liver disease requiring inpatient liver transplant evaluation

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02860506

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Chief Doctor, Professor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2023-04-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-04-26 02:25

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-04 14:48

Review time: 8 Days and 12 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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

In this manuscript, authors executed a single center retrospective cohort study to evaluate clinical characteristics of patients undergoing inpatient LTE and to assess the effects of delayed LTE on clinic outcomes. It was found that delaying LTE increased risk of death and reduced risk of LT in patients with CLD. Their findings were interesting and essential for improving the transplant referral process. However, there remains some comments taken for consideration during revision. 1. A recently published study indicated that evaluation within 30 days of referral for LT was associated with reduced mortality (PMID: 33587434). Differences in the demarcation of delayed and early referral LTE would influence the conclusions and clinic decision making, which should be discussed. 2. Please supplement how to diagnose malnutrition. Meanwhile, BMI and diabetes at referral should also be added. 3. The title needs to be adjusted, owing to the fact that this study only enrolled patients with CLD and didn't include patients with liver malignancies. 4. Define the abbreviation when it first appeared, like CLD.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Transplantation*

Manuscript NO: 85393

Title: Delayed referral liver transplant evaluation is associated with worse outcomes in patients with chronic liver disease requiring inpatient liver transplant evaluation

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04015916

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2023-04-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-09 13:17

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-17 08:21

Review time: 7 Days and 19 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" 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 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 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

This paper only uses the data from one center, and there are many layers in data analysis. Is it because of the small sample size and geographical limitations that the objective results of the data are affected? It may be more convincing if multi-centers are combined or the research results are applied to future clinical cases for verification.