

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 86691

**Title:** Lowering the Threshold of Alanine Aminotransferase for Enhanced Identification of Significant Hepatic Injury in Chronic Hepatitis B Patients.

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 00159278

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-07-02

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-07-03 06:28

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-07-03 10:11

**Review time:** 3 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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<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 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

I was asked to review the paper entitled "Lowering the Treatment Threshold of Alanine Aminotransferase for Enhanced Identification of Evidenced Hepatic Injury in the Grey Zone" It is a very interesting paper, with clinical impact and possible clinical applications. It is a well designed study, a strong point being that all the patients included have been evaluated by liver biopsy. I have some suggestions that, in my opinion, would improve the manuscript: Title 1. I think that the title should include "in chronic hepatitis B patients" Abstract 2. You should mention how is the "grey zone (GZ)" defined 3. "Evidenced hepatic injury" – I do not think that this is the most appropriate term – maybe "significant hepatic injury". I think it should be replace throughout the manuscript Results: 4. I think that you should underline in the results and also in discussion the number of patients who would benefit for treatment if the proposed ALT limits would be used Discussions: 5. First paragraph - You say: "The study showed that 50.22% of the CHB patients fell into the GZ category" I think that you should say: "The study showed that 50.22% of the patients with HBV infection fell into the GZ category" . 6. See number 4 7. Minor English polishind is needed

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 86691

**Title:** Lowering the Threshold of Alanine Aminotransferase for Enhanced Identification of Significant Hepatic Injury in Chronic Hepatitis B Patients.

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 00000663

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-07-02

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-07-03 06:24

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-07-11 16:20

**Review time:** 8 Days and 9 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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

The authors investigated the histological severity of liver disease in patients fitting the criteria of “grey zone” (GZ) among cases with HB infection (either chronic hepatitis B or simple infection). The definition of grey zone is based on ALT and HBV DNA levels, that are used to define the need for antiviral treatment. Based on a very large setting of cases (n = 1617) and 802 subjects fitting the criteria of GZ, they tested the histological severity in this last cohort, as well as the changes in treatment criteria according to reduction of cut-off ALT levels. Data confirm the need to rely on much lower ALT levels to effectively treat subjects at risk of disease progression (as also defined by surrogate biomarkers of progressive liver disease). I have only minor comments. 1. The study is rather difficult to read, considering the multiple comparisons. As also commented by authors, the classification of GZ is not static, and may be assessed at any new contact. I invite the authors to comment on the classical finding that AST and particularly platelets are probably better estimates to define the severity of liver disease, compared with ALT. 2.

The suggesting that lowering the ALT threshold to 30/19 UI/L improves the definition of cases progressing to advanced disease is in keeping with data dating back



**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>

to 2002, when Prati et al (see Ann Intern Med 2002;137:1-9) updated the definition of normal ALT values in CHC. I do believe that it's time to accept these very low levels as "normal limits" in all cases. 3. The same is probably true for the effect of age, where the limit of 30 years appears totally insufficient to define cases at risk of future HCC. The more intense and earlier treatment, the best to reduce the risk.