

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pathophysiology

Manuscript NO: 31381

Title: Effect of replenishment of vitamin D on survival in patients with decompensated liver cirrhosis: A prospective study

Reviewer's code: 02861252

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-11-15

Date reviewed: 2016-11-17

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

good work

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pathophysiology

Manuscript NO: 31381

Title: Effect of replenishment of vitamin D on survival in patients with decompensated liver cirrhosis: A prospective study

Reviewer's code: 00006258

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-11-15

Date reviewed: 2016-11-21

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is well written and covers an area of current clinical interest. The data is presented and described well and comes from a reasonably sized cohort of patients. My main concern relates to the interpretation and title of the manuscript. The authors report no significant change in mortality, survival or longevity, following VD supplementation. Modest effects are only seen in the multivariate analysis where confidence is low- thus the title of the article is misleading. Similarly within the study groups, 84% of patients were described as being vit D deficient. However VD deficiency is relatively common in many populations. In India prevalence can be as high as 70%. Thus it would be very important to incorporate an age and sex matched control population without cirrhosis. Otherwise it is very hard to confer causality. Table 5 is very useful but does highlight the lack of originality in the current study. Similarly the studies reviewed do suggest that one might have expected a response to treatment in the current study. Would be helpful to have a discussion of routes and details of

administration strategies in the reviewed articles to contract to the current study where Vit D administered IM and orally. Was the dose and route used here appropriate? Also I wonder whether this Table could be presented in a clearer / more impactful way as a schematic figure perhaps? It certainly needs a better title. The manuscript text describes the information in this table 'We also performed systemic review of prevalence and the role of VDD in patients with CLD. ' Presenting this section as a 'systematic review' in this way is misleading and full details of review protocol and exclusions should be given if it is badged thus. Currently no detail given in the methods section to outline the review strategy- better to brand as a 'review' of the literature. Minor comments Although aetiologies of CLD within the control and VD treated groups are supplied in the results text it would be important to highlight these in the demographic tables. The Tables should be accompanied by descriptive legends and titles for clarity.