



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 37970

Title: Compared efficacy of preservation solutions on the outcome of liver transplantation. Meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 00053888

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2018-01-31

Date reviewed: 2018-02-01

Review time: 16 Hours

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] 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"/> [Y] 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"/> [Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have carried out a meta analysis of RCTs comparing the 4 commonly used liver preservation agents in routine use. Their efforts were hampered by a lack of well constructed RCTs in this setting but nevertheless the data produced is useful. The authors have not over interpreted their findings and have concluded that there appears to be no difference in the main outcome measures but that further well designed RCTs are required for a definitive answer. These data are worthy of publication.



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 37970

Title: Compared efficacy of preservation solutions on the outcome of liver transplantation. Meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 01221925

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2018-02-17

Date reviewed: 2018-02-17

Review time: 20 Hours

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 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

This is an interesting paper looking at different preservation solutions for deceased donor liver transplantation. Could the authors please respond to the following questions/comments: 1) As the authors see no difference between the solutions in their meta-analysis, which solution would they recommend and why? Should cost be an issue? 2) Can the authors add a paragraph in the discussion regarding the role of these solutions in more complex donors, ie non-heart beating donors or living donors or extended criteria donors?



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 37970

Title: Compared efficacy of preservation solutions on the outcome of liver transplantation. Meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 00051373

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2018-02-17

Date reviewed: 2018-02-18

Review time: 23 Hours

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"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a meta-analysis with 15 manuscripts for comparison with the advantage of four preservation solutions in cadaveric organ donation. The current result is not much innovation and to have something misinterpretations about the outcome of the cadaveric donor liver transplantation. The author would like to looking forward the points to interpretation the primary non-function and graft survival for 1 year on the difference preservation solutions, but it is closely related to the intrinsic factors such as the ischemic time and a normal functional graft coming from the donor. The preservation solution is look like a basic technique for surgical liver transplantation. The author needs to deeply interpretation the different content with the high sodium in the IGL-1 and CS, and what about the low sodium content in UW and HTK. In my own opinion, it should not be accepting in a high impact journal with the current style.



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 37970

Title: Compared efficacy of preservation solutions on the outcome of liver transplantation. Meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 00842923

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2018-01-31

Date reviewed: 2018-02-20

Review time: 19 Days

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 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

The manuscript by Szilagyi et al. have evaluated the efficacy of HTK, Celsior and IGL-1 vs UW (gold standard). With four most used commercial solutions which were associated with nearly equivalent outcomes. Studies reported by Adam in AJT et al should be comented in detail.



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 37970

Title: Compared efficacy of preservation solutions on the outcome of liver transplantation. Meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 02860897

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2018-02-15

Date reviewed: 2018-02-23

Review time: 8 Days

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Donor source expansion is a global challenge and transplantation using extended criteria donor (ECD) graft is increasing. Aging and medical expenses are on the rise, more advanced technology for safely using ECD graft Innovation is required. Summary of organ transplantation is very important. This report is very timely and also suggestive for future direction.