

Reviewer 1

1. This is an interesting study regarding the evaluation of predictors of mortality among patients with cirrhosis and AKI. The relevant descriptions in the “Abstract” section have to be clarified according to the corresponding contents in the “Materials and Methods”. For example, infection and non-infection?

Ans: I thank reviewer for the critical review of manuscript. Appropriate correction has been done in abstract section.

2. The “RESULTS” of the “Abstract” section has to be concise.

Ans: The suggestion of the reviewer has been complied and changes have been made accordingly.

3. Why the authors did not measure the “PAMPs” and “DAMPs” in the present study?

Ans: We did not measure “PAMPs” and “DAMPs” as our institution did not have competent facilities for the same.

4. The major endpoint of this study is “mortality”, why the authors only exclude those with HCC? How about other cancers?

Ans: Though we excluded HCC in exclusion criteria, none of the included patients had any malignancy.

5. All variables with $P < 0.1$ in univariate analysis were included in multivariate regression analysis. Please explain why p value < 0.1 ?

Ans: We wish to quote

“Any variable having a significant univariate test at some arbitrary level is selected as a candidate for the multivariate analysis. We base this on the Wald test from logistic regression and p -value cut-off point of 0.25. More traditional levels such as 0.05 can fail in identifying variables known to be important. In the iterative process of variable selection, covariates are removed from the model if they are non-significant and not a confounder. Significance is evaluated at the 0.1 alpha level.”

Reference

Bursac Z, Gauss CH, Williams DK, Hosmer DW. Purposeful selection of variables in logistic regression. Source Code Biol Med. 2008;3:17. doi: 10.1186/1751-0473-3-17. PMID: 19087314; PMCID: PMC2633005.

6. In the “Discussion” section, the authors mentioned about “It is also important that once infection recovered then there was no difference in three-month mortality”. Based on the findings of the present study, it is not appropriate to make this interpretation.

Ans: The point is well taken and modified accordingly.

7. In the “Limitations”, why the data on beta blockers was not available at baseline is a limitation?

Ans: As many patients were referred from other hospitals, due to inadequate record, data on beta blockers was not available for all the patients.

Reviewer 2

1. The authors do not need to describe the results too much in the text, but just use tables to express them.

Ans: I thank reviewer for the critical review of manuscript. The result section has been revised accordingly.

2. The number of cases is limited, increasing the number of cases is more convincing.

Ans: The point is well taken. However, the duration of study was 1 year. Due to this the number of cases was limited.

3. Please check the Spelling and Punctuation.

Ans: Thanks for suggestion. The English language has been checked for spelling and punctuation.