



### PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 55536

**Title:** Update on diagnosis and management of sepsis in cirrhosis: Current advances

**Reviewer's code:** 05227894

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-03-22

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-03-23 02:14

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-03-25 07:18

**Review time:** 2 Days and 5 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<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 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



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

In this manuscript, the authors summarize the current status of research on the diagnosis and treatment of sepsis in patients with cirrhosis and discuss the future prospects. Sepsis in cirrhotic patients still has a high mortality rate, and its thus necessary to make an early diagnosis and perform treatment according to an appropriate treatment algorithm. The issues are clear, and the content discussed in each section is appropriate. The figures are reasonably clear. However, I have several concerns that need to be addressed before considering publication. 1. In the 'TREATING SEPSIS IN CIRRHOSIS' section, systematic review and meta-analysis on the effects of corticosteroids are cited, but no references. It may be appropriate to include references. 2. I searched PubMed but could not find the cited references No. 68 (Philips CA et al. Hepatology 2015) and No. 70 (Ahamed R et al. J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2019). Please confirm about it.



### PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 55536

**Title:** Update on diagnosis and management of sepsis in cirrhosis: Current advances

**Reviewer's code:** 05086666

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** BSc, DPhil, MBBS, MRCP

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United Kingdom

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-03-22

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-03-23 09:52

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-03-29 14:15

**Review time:** 6 Days and 4 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<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 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



**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](http://www.wjgnet.com)

This review provides an update on the pathophysiology and management of sepsis in patients with liver cirrhosis. The general structure of the review is good but there are some areas that need further attention before it is acceptable for publication. The major issue I think is with lack of adequate referencing of relevant literature. For example in Figure 5 the authors propose an algorithm for the treatment of sepsis in cirrhosis, but they don't provide the evidence on which these recommendations are made. eg. They recommend LOLA for overt hepatic encephalopathy, but the evidence to support this recommendation is not referenced in the figure legend or main text. Likewise, the authors make recommendations about feeding, sedation, ventilation vasopressors etc without providing the evidence for these recommendations. Likewise in Figure 1 the authors include many sepsis severity scores, without references in the figure legend or in the text. The figures are in general good but they need further details in the legends so that the figures can be read in isolation. For example in figure 2, the authors show red crosses over the arrows that lead from "removed via ferritin" and "Sepsis - Progression" boxes but I am not sure what these crosses represent as there is not adequate labelling. The authors refer to "cirrhotic patients" or "cirrhotics" where as it would be more appropriate to refer to these as "patients with cirrhosis". I would suggest that the authors revise the whole manuscript with regards to this.