

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15109

**Title:** Use of NSBBS in cirrhosis: the evidence we need before closing (or not!) the window

**Reviewer's code:** 02861217

**Reviewer's country:** Armenia

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2014-11-08 21:55

**Date reviewed:** 2014-11-10 02:03

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript touches upon very important and actual sphere of Hepatology as a contraversion data concerning usage of Non-Selective Beta Blockers (NSBBs) in patients with advanced liver disease. It is good review of different studies in this complicated and crucial field of Practical Hepatology. Certainly, it could be published in World Journal of Hepatology. Dear Authors few mistakes like: a. "Hyperkynetic" preferable with "i" (page 2); b. "On Among them, the ability of NSBBs to reduce the gastro-intestinal permeability to bacterial by-products is an (a) favorable effect that occurs in both hemodynamic responders and non-responders (page 3). c. after vs should be dot (vs.).

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15109

**Title:** Use of NSBBS in cirrhosis: the evidence we need before closing (or not!) the window

**Reviewer's code:** 02979670

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2014-11-08 21:55

**Date reviewed:** 2014-11-17 14:33

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed 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 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		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper discussed the validity of Non-Selective Beta Blockers (NSBBs) in patients with cirrhosis. The authors reviewed the published papers concerning NSBBs in cirrhosis and pointed out there existed contradictory results about NSBBs efficacy for patients with advanced cirrhosis. The debate about therapy efficacy of NSBBs for cirrhosis may result from poor methodological quality of some studies, including the lack of randomization to the treatment or not and the insufficient number of patients included in the final analysis. Finally, the authors emphasized the importance of randomized, multicenter RCT with sufficient number of patients for the conclusion of the true efficacy of NSBBs. Generally, the authors presented an interesting topic for readers. They provided enough literature material and did excellent discussion for the question. The manuscript was well arranged and the language was very good. So my conclusion is accept.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15109

**Title:** Use of NSBBS in cirrhosis: the evidence we need before closing (or not!) the window

**Reviewer's code:** 02861195

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2014-11-08 21:55

**Date reviewed:** 2014-11-19 16:24

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

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Although the Authors mention the importance of NSBB in the reduction of bacterial translocation and the latter's relevance in spontaneous bacterial peritonitis, their (yet unclear) role not only in hemodynamically preventing variceal bleeding, but also as a result of a reduced bacterial translocation, should be discussed as well. There are several typographic errors and some sentences warrant rephrasing (minor English language polishing). Regarding the rest, overall this is a well-balanced paper which summarizes the present conceptions on NSBB in cirrhosis, and also delineates the direction and characteristics of future research.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15109

**Title:** Use of NSBBS in cirrhosis: the evidence we need before closing (or not!) the window

**Reviewer's code:** 00053451

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2014-11-08 21:55

**Date reviewed:** 2014-11-20 07:41

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Summary and general comments This is an Editorial article about the application and clinical effect of NSBBS in cirrhosis. The authors overviewed recent studies, and discussed the benefits and risks of the treatment. I have a following observation. Page 4, second paragraph The observation by Ruiz-del-Arbol et al. (20) that ..... Please re-organize the paragraph more clearly and logically, as what the authors are trying to express is somewhat vague.