PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 46606

Title: Value of pretransplant albumin-bilirubin score in predicting outcomes after liver transplantation

Reviewer's code: 00054120

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Ruo-Yu Ma

Date sent for review: 2019-02-19

Date reviewed: 2019-02-20

Review time: 10 Hours, 1 Day

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Accept (General priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[Y] Minor revision	[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Major revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[Y] Advanced
			[ ] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank   you for submitting   your article to the World Journal of Gastroenterology, very interesting concept that you looked at. However, I have few questions and comments;

1- Why you have chosen the recipients from DCD only and not including recipients from

the conventional deceased donors? Although, the way you did it gave you one homogenous group but in the same token, this group with possibly higher post-operative complication rate due to the quality of the organs, including other recipients may broaden your scope and give more creditability to your study. 2- I noticed in Table-2 that the group with high ALBI scores has also higher MELD and higher Child grade. I wonder if you can look at this group (high ALBI) in a different way by splitting them into 2 subgroups; 1- with MELD= or more than 10 and 2- with less than 10. you may find that the impact of MELD score is more evident in this group than just ALBI score. Regards

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Accept (General priority)	[ ] Onymous
[Y] Grade C: Good	[Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[Y] Minor revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Major revision	[ ] Advanced
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[ ] General
			[Y] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

A lot of factors were used for univariate and multivariate analyses. Authors suggested an usefulness of their own score for LT waiting list. Especially in multivariate analyses, smaller factors should be used. Briefly, statistical analysis by using smaller factors (e.g.,

your score, MELD score, Child-Pugh score) may show another results, because sample size was small for power analyses.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No