

To,  
The Editor,  
World Journal of Hepatology

Re: 64278: **Current state of medical tourism involving liver transplantation - The risk of infections and potential complications**

Dear Sir/Madam:

Attached, please find the revised manuscript based on the reviewers and editors' comments. We hope that your readership will enjoy reading it and will benefit from it. We like to take this opportunity to thank the editorial staff for the time and patience and confidence in us. Please let us know with any questions.

Regards

Salim Surani, MD

Reviewer				#1:
<b>Scientific</b>	<b>Quality:</b>	Grade	B	(Very good)
<b>Language</b>	<b>Quality:</b>	Grade	A	(Priority publishing)
<b>Conclusion:</b>		Accept	(General	priority)

**Specific Comments to Authors:** 1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Yes 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? N/A 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? N/A 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? Yes 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? N/A 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? N/A 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Yes 11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion

sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? Yes 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Yes 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? N/A 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? N/A Specific Comments To Authors: I read with great interest the editorial entitled "Current state of medical tourism involving liver transplantation - The risk of infections and potential complications" and submitted to the World Journal of Transplantation. The manuscript is well-written and discuss an important issue about transplantation tourism, what is not well reported in the previous literature. I would only suggest to shorten a the text avoiding unnecessary paragraphs (like paragraphs 1 and 2, for example).

Response: We like to thank the reviewer for their positive response and feedback. The manuscript has been modified based on the recommendation and condensed.

#### 4 LANGUAGE QUALITY

Please resolve all language issues in the manuscript based on the peer review report. Please be sure to have a native-English speaker edit the manuscript for grammar, sentence structure, word usage, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, format, and general readability, so that the manuscript's language will meet our direct publishing needs.

#### 5 EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS

Authors must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which are listed below:

- (1) *Science editor:*** 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes an editorial of the current state of medical tourism involving liver transplantation. The topic is within the scope of the WJH. (1) Classification: Grade B; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The authors found a great interest the editorial, which is well-written and discuss an important issue about transplantation tourism. However, the text avoiding unnecessary paragraphs should be shortened. The questions raised by the reviewer should be answered; and (3) Format: There are no tables and figures. (4) References: A total of 27 references are cited, including 9 references published in the last 3 years; (5) Self-cited references: There are no self-cited references; and (6) References recommend: The

authors have the right to refuse to cite improper references recommended by peer reviewer(s), especially the references published by the peer reviewer(s) themselves. If the authors found the peer reviewer(s) request the authors to cite improper references published by themselves, please send the peer reviewer's ID number to the [editorialoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:editorialoffice@wjgnet.com). The Editorial Office will close and remove the peer reviewer from the F6Publishing system immediately. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade A. 3 Academic norms and rules: No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. No financial support was obtained for the study. The topic has not previously been published in the WJH. 5 Issues raised: (1) The authors should add some figures or tables. 6 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

Response: We appreciate the Scientific editor comments. The figure and table has been added in the manuscript

**(2) Editorial office director:**

**(3) Company editor-in-chief:** I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Hepatology, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Before final acceptance, the author(s) must add a table/figure to the manuscript.

Response: We appreciate the feedback. Figure and table have been added in the manuscript as suggested.