

### PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 75974

**Title:** Efficacy and safety of COVID-19 vaccination in patients with cirrhosis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05900983 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

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

Manuscript submission date: 2022-02-23

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-03-02 03:34

Reviewer performed review: 2022-03-02 03:36

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous



statements

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

# SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Nil



# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 75974

Title: Efficacy and safety of COVID-19 vaccination in patients with cirrhosis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05935566 Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBBS, MS

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

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

Manuscript submission date: 2022-02-23

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-03-16 04:08

Reviewer performed review: 2022-03-16 04:09

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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) [ Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous



https://www.wjgnet.com

statements

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

# SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Good work



# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 75974

**Title:** Efficacy and safety of COVID-19 vaccination in patients with cirrhosis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05351456 Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FACP, MBBS

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

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

Manuscript submission date: 2022-02-23

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-03-16 16:02

Reviewer performed review: 2022-03-16 16:21

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	[Y] Yes [] No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous



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

**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com **https:**//www.wjgnet.com

statements

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

#### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Peer review: Authors present safety and efficacy data of COVID-19 vaccination in patients with cirrhosis Major comments: Abstract conclusion "Revaccination should be carried out within the sixth month after the injection of the first dose of the vaccine" how did the authors reach that conclusion. There is no mention of this in the entire abstract and suddenly "6 months revaccination"? The overall design of the study is not clear. Are the authors describing "case-control" design? If so, then under methods there no place for "intervention" and "control". This is not a clinical trial. Entire section needs to be re-written. Describe this as "exposure" instead. How were the patients selected? There is no information about the case and control selection. One of the biggest concern is the "selection bias" and "volunteer bias". More often than not, the healthier subjects tend to be agreeable to take part in the research. Authors need to explain this clearly in the methods section. Outcomes: "primary outcome was the development of symptomatic COVID-19 case during the observation period" and this is tested by "positive PCR test of oropharyngeal or nasopharyngeal swab for SARS-CoV-2". Did the authors check the swab before including these patients in the study? Was there a confirmed negative swab before inclusion in the cases or controls group? "When evaluating the efficacy of revaccination, the vaccinated patients were considered unvaccinated 6 months after the administration of the first dose of Sputnik V." what is the rationale for this assumption? Were the antibody titers carried out? Spike protein levels? Nucleocapsid levels? Vaccine efficacy was estimated by 100×(1-IRR), where IRR (Incidence Rate Ratio) is the calculated ratio of cases of COVID-19 per 1 person-year of the observation in the vaccinated group to the corresponding illness rate in the unvaccinated group; 95% confidence interval (95% CI) for vaccine efficacy were obtained



https://www.wjgnet.com

by the Baptista-Pike method (on-line calculator "https://rdrr.io/cran/ORCI/man/BPexact.CI.html" was used). Has this method been validated? Why did authors choose this instead of titers/nucleocapsid/spike proteins? Did the study include outpatients? Inpatients? Or both? There is no information explicitly discussing this component COVID-19 was detected significantly more often in unvaccinated individuals than in vaccinated ones: this is not new information? What is surprising about it? What makes these results worth publishing? "Severe COVID-19 was detected in 50.0% of unvaccinated patients infected with the coronavirus and in none of vaccinated patient" This is also expected, nothing new here either Results: Table 2 and 3 presents only the unadjusted analysis. Results need to be adjusted for comorbidities that are known to increase the risk of mortality in these patients (Age, DM, CKD, VTE, etc). Unadjusted analysis is not performed and it would not be wise to draw any conclusions without adjusted analysis (adj odds ratio).



### RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 75974

**Title:** Efficacy and safety of COVID-19 vaccination in patients with cirrhosis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05900983 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

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

Manuscript submission date: 2022-02-23

Reviewer chosen by: Li-Li Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-27 09:58

Reviewer performed review: 2022-05-27 09:58

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] 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) [ Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous  Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No



# SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Can be accepted