

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Transplantation*

**Manuscript NO:** 82026

**Title:** Long-term Outcomes of Paediatric Liver Transplantation in Acute Liver Failure versus End-Stage Chronic Liver Disease: Retrospective Observational Study

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05476795

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-02

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-12-04 14:01

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-12-05 02:10

**Review time:** 12 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input 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

<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

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

- Is the donor sample collection accompanied by a medical record from the donor? this may be useful to know the outcome of the donor himself

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Transplantation*

**Manuscript NO:** 82026

**Title:** Long-term Outcomes of Paediatric Liver Transplantation in Acute Liver Failure versus End-Stage Chronic Liver Disease: Retrospective Observational Study

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06368358

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-02

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-12-05 14:22

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-12-09 05:18

**Review time:** 3 Days and 14 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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

<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

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Whole article requires restructuring with linguistic and technical correction as per the comments mentioned in word file of manuscript. 2. In manuscript, authors stated that they followed STROBE guideline for reporting the study. However, the check-list sent with the manuscript was of CONSORT statement and didn't consist the check-list's items according to the manuscript. STROBE checklist is missing. 3. Authors are confused about the study design. In material and methods, retrospective review article was written. If it is review article then why STROBE guideline? Reporting of the study research must be according to the study design. As per my opinion, this should be retrospective and cross-sectional type of observational study. Hence, it must be reported according to the STROBE guideline. Hence, reconstruct it according to the guideline. 4.

Title must include the type of study design. 5. Abstract is poorly written. o The need of the study is not reflected with the statements mentioned in background. o

Abstract is too long, contains more than 430 words. o In the abstracts, objectives were written poorly and also under the headings of aim. Hence, either change the heading or write main aim of the study. o In aim, word 'end-points' was used which is technically incorrect. o Method is not written properly. Write the comparative factors (the out-come variables of the study) clearly. o In Method, word 'analysis' was mentioned. What and how the analysis performed? 6. In introduction, unnecessary materials related to topic was written. However, the exact logical establishment of need of research and rationale behind the selection of topic is missing. 7. Timing period of cases enrolled (PLT performed) were found different in abstract and methods. 8. Flow diagram of participants is missing. It must be drawn. 9. Clinical management is not



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

written appropriately. It was reported like a prospective clinical interventional study. It must be modified according to the study design as it is retrospective observational study.

10. The exclusion criteria with reasons are not mentioned. Inclusion criteria is poorly written which consists only definition and clinical management. It must be elaborated properly. 11. The methods used for the collection of data and the study of outcomes must be elaborated.

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Transplantation*

**Manuscript NO:** 82026

**Title:** Long-term Outcomes of Paediatric Liver Transplantation in Acute Liver Failure versus End-Stage Chronic Liver Disease: Retrospective Observational Study

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06368358

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-02

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jia-Ru Fan

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-01-14 06:20

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-01-15 04:30

**Review time:** 22 Hours

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

**statements**Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [ **Y** ] No**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Good efforts done by the authors for making a manuscript valuable and of good quality literature by editing. I appreciate the style of answering of all comments of the reviewer exactly and one by one. 1. Introduction is better than the previous but not best. Challenges of diagnosis and management of ALD in compare to ESCLD children was described in Introduction. However, the importance and requirement of comparison of the outcomes of PLT children between above two groups is not mentioned. Find out it from literature or write it with your own experience or observation during the practice. Only the good rationale inside the introduction is helping to understand the research question as well as importance and high need of the selected research topics. 2. Clinical management of methodology was not proper. It should be mentioned as one of the eligibility criteria of the participants of the study. "What was done" in the patients should not require here, but the eligibility criteria related to performed treatment procedure should be mentioned. 3. Results, discussion and conclusions are ok.