



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hepatology*

Manuscript NO: 89491

Title: Predicting major adverse cardiovascular events after orthotopic liver transplantation using a supervised machine learning model: A cohort study

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 03755068

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Consultant Physician-Scientist

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Italy

Author’s Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-02

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-03 06:52

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-12 15:35

Review time: 9 Days and 8 Hours

Scientific quality	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The Authors applied a Machine Learning model to evaluate pre-transplant factors that may predict post-operative, in-hospital major cardiovascular events. They collected 575 LT recipients who underwent surgery between 2001 and 2011, using 83 pre-transplant variables. Then, they built a ML algorithm that showed a good performance for predicting major cardiovascular events (the AUROC was 0.89). Factors associated with post-operative major cardiovascular events were beta blockers, blood type, results of non-invasive stress tests. The aim of this paper is of interest. Nonetheless, the ML model usually applies on very large databases with huge amounts of data. In this paper, the number of patients included in relatively low (575), therefore in my opinion the Authors should explain why they decided to use ML approach instead of a standard statistical analysis. Further, the Authors should, in my opinion, clarify if the definition of MACE (a composite outcome including stroke, new-onset heart failure, severe arrhythmia, and nonfatal myocardial infarction) has been previously applied in the transplant setting or not. Indeed, it is not clear if fatal myocardial infarction has been included or not, or what is the definition of severe arrhythmia, or the relationship between stroke and



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

pre-transplant cardiac assessment. Finally, the Introduction section discusses about the unreliability of non-invasive stress tests before transplantation: according to this study, alteration of myocardial perfusion scintigraphy and negative stress test have been included in the proposed algorithm. Additionally, it should be cleared if all patients underwent, before transplant, the same pre-operative cardiological assessment. These points, in my opinion, are very impactful, in a future attempt of external validation. Minor issues > why patients transplanted between 2001 and 2011 were collected? > why the XGBoost model was used instead of other ML models? Regards.