

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hepatology*

Manuscript NO: 77343

Title: Quality of life, depression and anxiety in potential living liver donors for pediatric recipients: A retrospective single center experience

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02534372

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2022-06-06

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-11 05:53

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-21 08:08

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 Grade E: Do not publish
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a retrospective study, aimed to evaluate QOL, depression, and anxiety in potential living liver donors, indicating that PLLD had a low prevalence of anxiety and depression. Anxiety, depression, and low perceptions of QOL were more frequently observed in the NED group. The study was designed well, however I have one main concern; 1. Generally the study might need to have a control group, to compare the results with donor ones. This controls shall be matched according to demographic and socio-economic of donors. Without such controls, the conclusions regarding high or low psychological findings are too difficult. Specifically the authors just used the official global depression and anxiety prevalence, reported by WHO, instead of local prevalence from corresponding population in their own Country. So, to complete the analysis, author might to prepare at least local prevalence for those psychological factors or providing a matched control subjects.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hepatology*

Manuscript NO: 77343

Title: Quality of life, depression and anxiety in potential living liver donors for pediatric recipients: A retrospective single center experience

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06151472

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2022-06-06

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-25 13:51

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-25 14:37

Review time: 1 Hour

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 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 type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<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>

**Peer-reviewer
statements**

Peer-Review: [☒] Anonymous [☐] Onymous
Conflicts-of-Interest: [☐] Yes [☒] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This was a paper which explored QoL, anxiety and depression in potential living liver donors. The Authors investigated these domains through dedicated questionnaires. A total of 250 potential donors were interviewed between 2015 and 2019; of these, 140 effectively donated. Strengths - The aim of the study is easy to understand. - The Discussion section adequately discussed characteristics of potentially living donors, comparing data with that of other studies coming from Countries with different social and economic features. Pitfalls - It is not clear, however, why the remaining 150 pts were excluded from donation. Moreover, it was not clear if data coming from questionnaires was mainly or partly influenced the exclusion from donation. - Finally, the version of the manuscript available to me is not so easy to understand because of citation issues. Regards.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hepatology*

Manuscript NO: 77343

Title: Quality of life, depression and anxiety in potential living liver donors for pediatric recipients: A retrospective single center experience

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05908713

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Academic Fellow, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2022-06-06

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-27 01:51

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-27 02:15

Review time: 1 Hour

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 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



**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

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I read with great interest this retrospective study about psychological aspects of potential living donation. Here some comments: -An English Language check is needed. -The title is appropriate, but I would specify that it is a retrospective single center experience. -In the Methods, you should clarify how patients were enrolled: were they consecutive cases? if not which kind of enrollment was performed? I would remove the part about the items included form: they have been described elsewhere, you can just add the references and, if you want, you can send them as supplementary material. Similarly the questions you made can be put in a Table, and not within the text. An important point is: when the Forms and Questionnaires were administered? during the original decision-making period, or at the end, after the final decision of acceptance/refusal ? This is an important point, since the refusal or the acceptance can play themselves a role. -About the results: it is not clear why the PLLD have been accepted or refused for donation: was it because of psychological matters? If not, you should clarify how the differences you found could play a role within the process, or whether they are a consequence of it. -In the discussion I would add also something else about the novelty of your work and the differences with the many existing articles about this issue.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hepatology*

Manuscript NO: 77343

Title: Quality of life, depression and anxiety in potential living liver donors for pediatric recipients: A retrospective single center experience

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05226494

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MBBS, MD

Professional title: Additional Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2022-06-06

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-27 07:47

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-27 14:07

Review time: 6 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input checked="" 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="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I agree with the authors that the foundation for effective and satisfactory results of a living donor programme can be found in the pre-transplantation process, during which pre-donation psychological evaluation has a predictive role in post-donation mental health issues. 1. Why should you compare them between ED and NED. 2 Why only restrict to donors of paediatric recipients. 3. Relationship to the potential recipient should be stated in a table - mother/ father/ sister/ brother/ aunt/ and so on. 4. Outcome of the transplant should also be stated as atleast 30 day outcome. 5. Was psychological evaluation repeated after surgery in ED and after cancellation of surgery in NED. 6. What was the reason for classifying as NED can be presented in a table

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hepatology*

Manuscript NO: 77343

Title: Quality of life, depression and anxiety in potential living liver donors for pediatric recipients: A retrospective single center experience

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05226494

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MBBS, MD

Professional title: Additional Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2022-06-06

Reviewer chosen by: Han Zhang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-08-25 06:28

Reviewer performed review: 2022-08-26 13:30

Review time: 1 Day and 7 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 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 type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**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>

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I think the aim of the paper is good. However the methodology is not correct. The paper can be written as a review of the findings of the evaluation - socioeconomic ,psychological etc as that is a gold mine of information ; but without comparing the ED with NED; as the division and comaprison on the basis of donation does not justify the pre operative evauation.