



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 64585

**Title:** Soluble Programmed Death-1 is Predictive of HBsAg Loss in Chronic Hepatitis B Patients after Antiviral Treatment

**Reviewer's code:** 05533642

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-02-24

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-02-24 13:38

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-02-24 15:07

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" 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



**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)

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

1 Please refer to the following literature, After anti-viral treatment, serum SPD-1 levels and SPD-L1 levels were decreased rapidly. Lower baseline SPD-1 levels were associated with Hbeag clearance After 2 years of anti-viral treatment in HBeAg-positive chronic hepatitis B patients. Then both SPD-1 and SPD-L1 levels are recommended for analysis in this study. 2 This study confirmed that The sPD-1 levels were higher in patients with HBsAg loss than in those without HBsAg loss; The sPD-1 levels were negatively correlated with HBsAg levels; This is almost the opposite of the above research, which is strange. 3 The sample size of this study is small, and the results of Cox analysis are almost meaningless and not reliable. The correlation coefficient in correlation analysis is also very small. 4 Statistical analysis should clarify whether sPD-1 level at baseline predicts HBsAg loss or sPD-1 level during treatment predicts HBsAg loss. For example, the summary section, which part of the data predicted HBsAg loss is not explained in detail. [1] Xia J, Huang R, Chen Y, et al. Profiles of sPD-1 and sPD-L1 in chronic hepatitis B virus infected patients with different disease phases and after treatment. *Alimentary Pharmacology & Therapeutics*. 2020 Jun 51(11):1180-1187.



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 64585

**Title:** Soluble Programmed Death-1 is Predictive of HBsAg Loss in Chronic Hepatitis B Patients after Antiviral Treatment

**Reviewer’s code:** 05403123

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer’s Country/Territory:** Brazil

**Author’s Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-02-24

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-02-24 21:48

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-03-12 01:00

**Review time:** 15 Days and 3 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<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 checked="" 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



**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

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

1 Title. Ok 2 Abstract. The abstract summarizes and reflect the work described in the manuscript. 3 Key words. The key words must be described according to the MeSH Terms. "Hepatitis B Surface Antigens" instead of "HBsAg" "Hepatitis B e Antigens" instead of "HBeAg" 4 Background. Ok 5 Methods. #Patient selection criteria should be better described: - Were patients who consume alcoholic beverages included? What was the limit of daily alcohol intake allowed to include the patient in the study? - Were patients with steatosis excluded? - Why was there no inclusion of patients treated with tenofovir? - How many patients were excluded? Were there any patient losses during follow-up? Consideration should be given to using of a flow diagram. # In Table 1, it would be interesting to describe separately the number of patients who used lamivudine or adefovir dipivoxil. 6 Results. The results of the research are interesting and intriguing. 7 Discussion. Do the authors believe that different Elisa kits for dosing sPD-1levels can contribute to discrepant results in similar studies? Authors should comment on this in the discussion discussion. 8 Illustrations and tables. ok 9 Biostatistics. ok 10 Units. ok 11 References. ok 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. ok 13 Research methods and reporting. Why did the authors use the ARRIVE Guidelines? Did the authors use STROBE Statement? 14 Ethics statements. ok