

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 33450

Title: Bacterial infections post-living-donor liver transplantation in Egyptian cirrhotic patients: A single-center study

Reviewer's code: 00071587

Reviewer's country: India

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2017-02-14

Date reviewed: 2017-03-09

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The peer-reviewer should consider and make note of the following items:

- (1) Is the overall structure of the manuscript complete? A complete manuscript will contain title, abstract, key words, introduction, materials, methods, experimental procedure, results, discussion, conclusion, acknowledgements, and references.

Yes. The structure is complete except there is no acknowledgement section. Further to this, the last paragraph under statistical methods "The statistical methods of this study were reviewed by Sameh M Hakim, Diploma of Medical Biostatistics, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt." Should be removed and pasted at the acknowledgement section.

- (2) What is the scientific question proposed in the manuscript? This should be clearly presented in the Introduction section, along with the pertinent background, rationale, aim, major findings and potential significance of the study. Collectively, this information should inform whether the manuscript would be interesting enough to warrant readers' attention?

What are the risk factors, causative organisms and antimicrobial resistance pattern of bacterial infections following living-donor liver transplantation in Egyptian cirrhotic patients? Although the study was limited to Egyptian patients, the knowledge in the manuscript would be interesting enough to warrant readers' attention.

- (3) Which special (unique, innovative and/or timely, appropriate) methods and techniques are adopted in the manuscript? This should be clearly presented in the Methods section. In addition, does the manuscript provide adequate details of methods (including experimental design, subjects or materials, data collection methods, and statistical methods) to allow a reader to repeat the research?

There were no unique or innovative methods. It was a standard method that was done previously by other investigators.

- (4) Is the source of the data that is presented reliable? This will be indicated by the information presented in the Results section. The information in the results section will also indicate the academic significance of the main findings (including figure and tables).

Yes. The source of the data that was presented was reliable as it was discussed.

- (5) What are the results obtained from the data that is presented in the manuscript? This information will make up the Discussion section. It will also answer the questions of whether the results answered the proposed scientific question, achieved the aim of the study, or confirmed or rejected the hypothesis proposed in the manuscript.

The results obtained were discussed appropriately in the discussion section.

- (6) What are the conclusions of the manuscript? These should be clearly presented in the Conclusion section. In addition, the section should present the contributions of the conclusions to the field and the weaknesses of the study, and provide future research directions.

Conclusion was clear and concise.

(7) Does the manuscript cite all important, relevant and timely references?

Yes.

(8) Is there any indication of academic misconduct in the manuscript?

No.

(9) Does the manuscript conform to the academic rules and norms and include a human and animal rights statement, institutional review board statement, informed consent statement, clinical trial registration statement, institutional animal care and use committee statement, animal care and use statement, biostatistics statement, and conflict-of-interest statement?

Yes.

(10) Does the manuscript describe any important new methods, problems in or directions of research?

No new methods.

(11) Does this manuscript contribute to understanding the pathogenesis of disease, disease diagnosis, and treatment or prevention?

Yes.

(12) Does the title of the manuscript contain key words, and is the title interesting enough to attract readers' attention?

Yes. However, The title does not indicate that the study was performed on hepatitis C patients despite that all of these patients are hepatitis C cases; this should be made clear in the title.

(13) Does the topic of the manuscript fall within the scope of World Journal of Hepatology?

Yes.

(14) Does the language of the manuscript reach the standard of publishing?

Yes. However, it needs very minor linguistics corrections and/or rephrasing

Peer-reviewers' conclusions

The peer-reviewer should use the considerations above to determine the following conclusions about the manuscript's potential for publication:

- (1) What are the new visions that the manuscript offers to readers?

Another prospective study on bacterial infection post liver transplant.

- (2) Are there any weaknesses or deficiencies in the manuscript?

Only minor issues as pointed above.

- (3) Can the experiences and lessons presented in the manuscript improve the readers' practice?

Yes.

- (4) Does the content of the manuscript have value for publication? If not, rejection should be recommended.

Yes.

- (5) Is the manuscript concise, clear, comprehensive, and convincing?

Yes.

I recommend acceptance of this manuscript for publication after minor corrections as explained above.