# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Hepatology

**Manuscript NO:** 51192

**Title:** Concise review of machine perfusion in liver transplantation

**Reviewer's code:** 03737603

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, MSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Surgeon

**Reviewer's country:** United Kingdom

**Author's country:** United States

**Reviewer chosen by:** Artificial Intelligence Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-09-01 19:19

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-09-02 13:08

**Review time:** 17 Hours

| 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| [  ] Grade E: Do not publish | | [  ] Rejection | [Y] Advanced |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

Dear Editor Thank you for asking me to review the manuscript. I would like to suggest

to the authors to present their search strategy of the literature for example how many databases have been searched and the number of relevant articles found

## 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: |
| [ ] Grade B: Very good | [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing | [ ] Accept (General priority) | [Y] Anonymous |
| [ ] Grade C: Good | [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | [ ] Minor revision | [ ] Onymous |
| [ ] Grade D: Fair | [ ] Grade D: Rejection | [ ] Major revision | Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript: |
| [Y] Grade E: Do not publish | | [Y] Rejection | [Y] Advanced |
| | | | [ ] General |
| | | | [ ] No expertise |
| | | | Conflicts-of-Interest: |
| | | | [ ] Yes |
| | | | [Y] No |

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

3

Very concise manuscript with serious problem in the literature review performed or not performed. Sounds more like a letter to the editor or something similar. Unfortunately it does not feel like reviewing the literature on the subject. This topic have more veriety of studies, modalities, phase studies and clinical trials.

## 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

# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Hepatology

**Manuscript NO:** 51192

**Title:** Concise review of machine perfusion in liver transplantation

**Reviewer's code:** 03293832

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:**

**Professional title:**

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Author's country:** United States

**Reviewer chosen by:** Artificial Intelligence Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-09-02 03:39

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-09-05 05:42

**Review time:** 3 Days and 2 Hours

| 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 | [ ] Advanced |
| | | | [Y] General |
| | | | [ ] No expertise |
| | | | Conflicts-of-Interest: |
| | | | [ ] Yes |
| | | | [Y] No |

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

concise and easily comprehensible review. Sentences need improvement. I suggested in

5

the attached file.

## 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

# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Hepatology

**Manuscript NO:** 51192

**Title:** Concise review of machine perfusion in liver transplantation

**Reviewer's code:** 03317080

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Postdoctoral Fellow

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Author's country:** United States

**Reviewer chosen by:** Artificial Intelligence Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-09-04 15:35

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-09-05 15:09

**Review time:** 23 Hours

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

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

General considerations The present manuscript is a concise review focusing on the

clinical outcome and recent advances in machine perfusion for liver transplantation. It is really concise; nonetheless, it well written and provides a good overview on the clinical state-of-art of this preservation technique.    Minor considerations and suggestions. At the end of the review there is a paragraph more on the "future perspective" side, about the preservation of fatty liver in preclinical settings. I noted that subnormothermic machine perfusion has not been covered. The author should briefly describe also this setting, for a more complete survey on machine perfusion (i.e.: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19109848;

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27860296).    Moreover, subnormothermic machine perfusion has been shown to be suitable also in a non-heart-beating donor preclinical setting; I suggest the author to add a few lines also about this issue (i.e.: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21315707;

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22974898).    Subnormothermic machine perfusion has been shown to be very effective in marginal liver preservation by various authors in a preclinical settings; in my opinion a review about machine perfusion should necessarily cover this variant. The author should briefly explain what HOPE is; I believe that, for a naive reader, the difference between HMP and HOPE may be lost. Similarly, the author may briefly define the temperature intervals defining HMP, SMP and NMP.

**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

# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Hepatology

**Manuscript NO:** 51192

**Title:** Concise review of machine perfusion in liver transplantation

**Reviewer's code:** 03475120

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** FACS, MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Director, Doctor, Surgeon

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Author's country:** United States

**Reviewer chosen by:** Artificial Intelligence Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-09-02 01:26

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-09-18 00:02

**Review time:** 15 Days and 22 Hours

| 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 | [ ] Advanced |
| | | | [ ] General |
| | | | [Y] No expertise |
| | | | Conflicts-of-Interest: |
| | | | [ ] Yes |
| | | | [Y] No |

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper is well written. For journal readers, please add some schemas of machine

10

perfusion. It is difficult to understand this by only sentences.


**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