

Dear Editor:

We are very excited to have been given the opportunity to revise our manuscript, titled "Is MELD score failing patients with liver disease and hepatorenal syndrome?"

We carefully considered your comments. Herein, we explain how we revised the paper based on those comments and recommendations.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27374

Title: Is MELD score failing patients with liver disease and hepatorenal syndrome?

Reviewer's code: 00068723

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-05-26 18:37

Date reviewed: 2016-05-26 20:27

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript discusses post-transplantation survival. The idea was interesting that renal failure was one major factor regarding survival after liver transplantation. The concept was rationale because normal renal function is essential for healthy. Renal failure consists one of the organ failure of multiple organ failure. References were limited number, which was acceptable because the manuscript was "to the Editor".



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

Thank you for your comment. We added additional references to our manuscript. Additional references are #1,2,5,7-9,11,12,13.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27374

Title: Is MELD score failing patients with liver disease and hepatorenal syndrome?

Reviewer's code: 00181388

Reviewer's country: Iran

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-05-26 18:37

Date reviewed: 2016-05-26 21:26

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Some sentences has been repeated multiple times like sentences about serum creatinine, MELD score, ... which can be deleted. 2. The text can be shorter by mixing some concepts. 3. Some sentences have no references while they need.

Thank you for your comment. The sentence "The risk of post-LT ESRD is a strong predictor of post-LT mortality" has been removed from the second paragraph. The sentence "MELD has been validated to predict wait-list mortality in transplant candidates and it impacts organ allocation" has been removed from the second paragraph. The discussion of MELD was moved to the last paragraph. Additional references have been added #1,2,5, 7-9, 11, 12, 13.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27374

Title: Is MELD score failing patients with liver disease and hepatorenal syndrome?

Reviewer's code: 02445121

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-05-26 18:37

Date reviewed: 2016-05-30 11:09

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this letter, the authors discussed that application of MELD score in the patients with liver disease and hepatorenal syndrome and suggested to reassess the application of MELD and the impact of renal insufficiency. This suggestion is reasonable and considerable.

Thank you for your comment.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27374

Title: Is MELD score failing patients with liver disease and hepatorenal syndrome?

Reviewer's code: 02445541

Reviewer's country: Netherlands

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-05-26 18:37

Date reviewed: 2016-05-30 17:50

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript ends with the statement; "While MELD score is the gold standard for predicting wait list mortality, a notable weakness for liver allocation lies in predicting post transplantation survival, particularly with renal insufficiency", and "to reassess the application of MELD and the impact of renal insufficiency". I fully agree that such a conversation is useful, but I miss considerations of others and the many references which already discuss the relative sensitivity and specificity of MELD as prognostic parameter. I give some examples but there are far more in literature. Gennaro D" Amico et al. J of Hepatol 2006;44:217-231 who conclude that clinical practice strengthens the current use of CPS in cirrhotic patients at large and MELD in decompensated cirrhotic patients. Theocharidou et al. The Royal Free Hospital score (RFH): a calibrated prognostic model for patients with cirrhosis admitted to Intensive care unit. Am J GE 2014; CLIF-SOFA did not perform better than RFH. Wan et al. Combining serum cystatin c with total bilirubin improves short term mortality prediction in patients with HBV related acute-on-chronic liver failure. PlosOne 2015;10(1)e 0116968. Emerson P et al. The utility of scoring systems in critically ill cirrhotic patients admitted to a general intensive care unit. J of critical care 2014; 29(6)1131, who suggest that serum

arterial lactate may improve the prognostic ability. Oberkofler CE et al. MELD score greater than 23 predicts length of stay in the ICU but not mortality in liver transplant recipients. Critical Care 2010;14:R117

Thank you for your comment. The various alternative prognostic models were added to the last paragraph with the additional references #11-13. "In addition to MELD, various scoring systems, including Child Pugh score, the RIFLE (risk of renal dysfunction, injury to the kidney, failure of the kidney, loss of kidney function, and end-stage kidney disease) criteria, SOFA score (sequential organ failure assessment), and the CLIF-SOFA score Chronic Liver Failure - Sequential Organ Failure Assessment) have been designed to predict outcomes in post liver transplant patients."

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27374

Title: Is MELD score failing patients with liver disease and hepatorenal syndrome?

Reviewer's code: 02860590

Reviewer's country: Brazil

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-05-26 18:37

Date reviewed: 2016-06-13 05:47

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Specific comments: The subject is relevant; however it is not a new topic in the literature. Several researchers have been analysing the limitation of the MELD score. On the other hand, it is important to recognize renal injury early before the damage is done. The manuscript should be described in a more concise and substantial manner. There is limited information regarding a theoretical framework that grounds the research. Please get a native English speaker to check the English used in the paper. Grammatical errors/constructions should be evaluated along the whole article. ? Reviewer conclusion: Accept but needs minor and major revision

Thank you for your comment. The manuscript has been revised to make it more concise and grammatically correct. The sentence "The risk of post-LT ESRD is a strong predictor of post-LT mortality" has been removed from the second paragraph. The sentence "MELD has been validated to predict wait-list mortality in transplant candidates and it impacts organ allocation" has been removed from the second paragraph. The discussion of MELD was moved to the last paragraph.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27374

Title: Is MELD score failing patients with liver disease and hepatorenal syndrome?

Reviewer's code: 00028366

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-05-26 18:37

Date reviewed: 2016-06-13 20:16

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The impact of renal insufficiency has been emphasised as an important part of assessment in association with MELD score and it is a relevant discussion. I support the authors suggestion

Thank you for your comment.

Again, we appreciate the opportunity to revise our work for consideration for publication in World Journal of Hepatology. We have revised the manuscript to incorporate the suggestions and look forward to your final decision.