

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Methodology*

**Manuscript NO:** 64885

**Title:** Liver Transplant Allocation Policies and Outcomes in USA: A Comprehensive Review

**Reviewer's code:** 03476715

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-02-24

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-02-25 11:46

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-03-09 01:23

**Review time:** 11 Days and 13 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <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>

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The manuscript comprehensively introduced the liver transplant allocation policies and outcomes in USA, which is informative for the readers. It is more like an introductory article rather than a systematic review. Although there are some merits in the article, several minor issues should not be ignored. 1. How does the author know “Region redistricting was not implemented due to statistically insignificant change in waitlist survival.” The source should be stated. 2. “The sequence of distribution is for candidates within a radius of 150 nautical miles from the donor hospital, then secondly for candidates within a radius of 150 nautical miles from the hospital and lastly for candidates within a radius of 500 nautical miles from the donor hospital [16].” It seems the distances would be a radius < 150 nautical miles, 150~ 500 nautical miles, > 500 nautical miles. 3. It would be helpful and ready to grasp the information in the manuscript if key outcome indices could be listed in a table.