

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hepatology*

Manuscript NO: 90669

Title: Palliative long-term abdominal drains vs large volume paracenteses for the management of refractory ascites in end-stage liver disease.

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 07717220

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Manuscript submission date: 2023-12-10

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-12-17 06:52

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-27 09:05

Review time: 10 Days and 2 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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 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 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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The study compared the effectiveness and safety of palliative LTAD and LVP in refractory ascites secondary to end-stage chronic liver disease by retrospective, observational cohort study. 1.The study design needs to be clearly defined in the abstract. 2.The small sample size(30 experimental groups, 19 control groups) affects the reliability of the results. Does the author consider extending the review time and increasing the sample size. 3.Limitations need to indicate that the current evidence quality and credibility are insufficient.In the future, larger sample study is needed, and it is recommended to conduct RCT to further validate the results. 4.The appendix needs to be provided to describe the other treatment methods received by these individuals during the period. 5.Potential confounding factors should also be described more clearly 6.Multiple subgroup/stratified analyses should be considered to eliminate potential confounding effects and enhance the reliability and stability of the results 7.Security should be described in the form of a table for easy reading by readers.