

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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 74705

Title: Current standard values of health utility scores for evaluating cost-effectiveness in

liver disease

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00005049 Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: BM BCh, FRCP (Hon), MD, MRCP

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-13

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-02-11 03:58

Reviewer performed review: 2022-02-11 09:01

Review time: 5 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No



Baishideng **Publishing**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

As a review paper, the authors should clearly describe how the listed studies in their paper have been selected, i.e. based on what criteria have they performed their literature search for this review. For each of the health utilities assessment tool, the authors should describe in more detail the scoring system and the implications of lower vs high score. Although SF36 and HUI are more complicated in terms of number of questions to be addressed by individual patients, it should be discussed that ED-5D-5L, with only 5 questions have major limitations on assessing final details of patient's' helath ultulity indexes.



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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 74705

Title: Current standard values of health utility scores for evaluating cost-effectiveness in

liver disease

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03662955 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Chief Physician, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-13

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Qi Zhu (Online Science Editor)

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-03-12 03:07

Reviewer performed review: 2022-03-21 12:40

Review time: 9 Days and 9 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No



Baishideng Publishing

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous

statements Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This review elaborated the health utility scores and Health Utilities Index scores for the normal population and chronic liver disease patients. Overall the article is well organized and its presentation is good. In addition, the novelty, clinical relevance, and scientific importance is acceptable.



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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 74705

Title: Current standard values of health utility scores for evaluating cost-effectiveness in

liver disease

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05458781 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Chief Physician, Doctor, Statistical Worker

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-13

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Qi Zhu (Online Science Editor)

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-03-10 12:25

Reviewer performed review: 2022-03-21 15:47

Review time: 11 Days and 3 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



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

https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous

statements Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Major revisions: In the mini-review, the author summarized the health utility scores. It had summarized the findings of previous studies examining health utility evaluations in patients with chronic liver disease, and the results showed the EQ-5D-5L is the most popular questionnaire for health utility assessments. However, What are the unique insights that this study presented? What are the key problems in this field that this study has solved? What are the innovative points of the manuscript, compared with the existing research? Neither in the introduction nor in the discussion was clearly stated. Minor revision: The methods and results sections are not clearly distinguished.