

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 56654

Title: Essential phospholipids for nonalcoholic fatty liver disease associated with metabolic syndrome: A systematic review and network meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 02942798

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Chief Doctor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Slovakia

Author's Country/Territory: Germany

Manuscript submission date: 2020-05-28

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-06-11 13:52

Reviewer performed review: 2020-06-14 16:39

Review time: 3 Days and 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear sir, thank you to select me to review manuscript Essential phospholipids for nonalcoholic fatty liver disease associated with metabolic syndrome: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. This is first study evaluating EPL in NAFLD patient. Although study is well made, there are several flaws limiting quality of the article: 1) Quality of 10 selected articles for metaanalysis is very low 2) Authors did not evaluated EPL impact on fibrogenesis (key point of NASH patients) 3) Dose of EPL is not given in the manuscript 4) Duration of EPL treatment in some studies is very short. My final decision is rejection.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 56654

Title: Essential phospholipids for nonalcoholic fatty liver disease associated with metabolic syndrome: A systematic review and network meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 03912491

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: Germany

Manuscript submission date: 2020-05-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-05-28 09:08

Reviewer performed review: 2020-06-20 21:12

Review time: 23 Days and 12 Hours

Scientific quality	<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
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

The Manuscript NO: 56654, titled "Essential phospholipids for nonalcoholic fatty liver disease associated with metabolic syndrome: a systematic review and network meta-analysis" by Asad Izziddin Dajani and Branko Popovic. The authors have reported that essential phospholipids administration in patients with NAFLD and diabetes and/or obesity produce a benefit. Further large-scale trials are warranted. I have a few concerns about the present manuscript: -Firstly, thank you to the authors for providing all the information with the meta-analysis that was constructed. It is important to mention that in the first paragraph the authors mention "data are mostly from small-scale studies", why is the purpose to do this meta-analysis? -The search detected 2.732 articles that fit with your keywords and then you only take into account 10. Why English and Chinese articles were added and not Spanish articles. -Where is the information to the PICO framework? -The authors add the Pubmed (MEDLINE) search, but the Scopus and EMBASE search is not mentioned in the entire article, also information about the Cochrane is missing -Risk of bias and all statistical analyses were performed in an excellent way -What is the future of essential phospholipids in NAFLD? It is a good therapeutic approach, and finally, an opinion section might be required to understand all the information

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 56654

Title: Essential phospholipids for nonalcoholic fatty liver disease associated with metabolic syndrome: A systematic review and network meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 00049727

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: Germany

Manuscript submission date: 2020-05-28

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-06-11 00:52

Reviewer performed review: 2020-06-21 01:27

Review time: 10 Days

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

This is the first meta-analysis to examine the effect of EPL in patients with NAFLD and diabetes or obesity, and it proved that EPL was beneficial for NAFLD and diabetic and/or obese patients. This analysis provided the necessity of further large-scale EPL trials and clarifying precise mechanisms of EPL for NAFLD/NASH. Major comments 1. There are three types of meta-analysis based on literature (MAL), summary data (MAS), and individual patient data (MAP or IPD). This paper belongs to MAS, but IPD would be better if they can get more data. IPD data are not limited to published data, but to obtain the most original data, which greatly reduces the publication bias and heterogeneity that are common in routine meta analysis. Ideally, all the papers related to the research topic should be included in the meta-analysis, whether it is published or not. So if it can, not only get data from the database, but also from some conference materials, or contact with researchers and pharmaceutical companies, to ensure the comprehensiveness of the meta-analysis. 2. This article is mainly about the data of small-scale clinical patients in many countries. I think the sample size needs to be larger. After all, the individual differences of patients should also be considered. 3. Because the quality of the research in each paper is different, I think we should treat each research according to the quality of the research, rather than treating them equally. For example, we can score the quality of the research, and the score is used as the weight in the combined research. 4. Molecular mechanisms regarding beneficial effect of EPL for murine alcoholic steatohepatitis have been demonstrated (Okiyama et al, J Hepatol 2009). The authors should cite the manuscript and discuss possible beneficial effects of EPL for obesity-related NAFLD/NASH.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 56654

Title: Essential phospholipids for nonalcoholic fatty liver disease associated with metabolic syndrome: A systematic review and network meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 00049727

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: Germany

Manuscript submission date: 2020-05-28

Reviewer chosen by: Le Zhang

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-09-14 03:25

Reviewer performed review: 2020-09-14 03:30

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	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

The authors properly responded to my questions.