

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**Manuscript NO:** 70494

**Title:** Drug-induced autoimmune hepatitis: A minireview

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05909642

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** Singapore

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-08-05

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-08-06 00:41

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-08-18 23:43

**Review time:** 12 Days and 23 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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
<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</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The review entitled “Drug-induced autoimmune hepatitis” covers the emerging topic in hepatology with appropriate comprehensive manner. Nevertheless, there are several shortcomings mainly in the way of assembly of literatures and of handling data. Concerns: 1. In Figure 2 for patient A: Information about the suspected drug for this case, sorafenib, should be included, like in Figure 4. 2. Figure 3 is missing. 3. In Table 3 and 4: Why did authors distinctively highlight NS (not statistically significant) and \* (statistically significant) in Table 3 and in Table 4, respectively? Two tables should be handled in same way and in more informative manner with each numerical p value. 4. In Table 3 and 4: Description of mean, median, and range etc are missing in several variables. 5. In Table 3, histopathology: The reference for AIH is missing. 6. In Table 4: In case putting multiple literatures together to compare certain variable, e.g., relapse rate, authors should include methods for statistical analysis. 7. In Table 4, histopathology in AIH: What did it mean “higher proportion of F4” in AIH 8. In Page 5, lane 2: AIH antibodies should be clearly described. 9. In Page 6, case discussion, Patient A: How high was serum IgG before administration of sorafenib? 10. In Page 12, lane 1: Is it appropriate to mention that both DIAIH and idiopathic AIH share similar female preponderance, if female prevalence of DIAIH was 62% as in Ref 9, that is likely less than that in AIH.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**Manuscript NO:** 70494

**Title:** Drug-induced autoimmune hepatitis: A minireview

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05910182

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** Singapore

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-08-05

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-08-09 04:42

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-08-22 09:26

**Review time:** 13 Days and 4 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 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
<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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	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 MS provides a good guide for general physicians to treat DILI. The English needs revision by a native English speaker. I suggest including the lymphocyte toxicity assay in addition to the MetaHeps test. The lymphocyte toxicity assay described by Neuman et al -n Clin Biochem 2000;33:517-24 has been in use for more than 2 decades. In summary I recommend accept after revision.