PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hepatology*

Manuscript NO: 87990

Title: Study of liver cirrhosis over twenty consecutive years in adults in Southern China

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02663375

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Academic Research, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-09-06

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-10-10 14:29

Reviewer performed review: 2023-10-10 15:41

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
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
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a well written article and I enjoyed reading it. Please change NAFLD and ALD with the new proposed terminology (Rinella ME, et al. A multi-society Delphi consensus statement on new fatty liver disease nomenclature. J Hepatol 2023)

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
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) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript by Wang et al describes a retrospective study of the population characteristics of patients hospitalized for liver cirrhosis at a single hospital in south China over the period of 2001-2020. The entire cohort was over 33,000, which is an impressive number. Overall, the changes in the population and the underlying etiology of LC did not show dramatic changes, which is perhaps not surprising for a slowly developing chronic condition. However, some significant trends were noted. Overall, the manuscript is a reasonable effort, but questions arise regarding the choices made for the analyses presented. These are listed below.   Why is no information given about the hospital/medical center? How many beds? Was it unchanged over the 20 years? Which raises a question about Fig. 1: why are there so many more patients in 2011-2020 relative to 2001-2010? What changed?   Fig. 2 shows a continuous line, when in fact it should be discontinuous. There are 8 overlapping three year intervals covering 2001-2010, and another 8 covering 2011-2020. Why not plot the each year separately? These decisions need to be justified.   Fig. 3 is not needed.   Table 2: What is the rationale for breaking into 5 year cohorts? Again, needs justification.   Good discussion of strengths and

limitations.