

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 9655

Title: Hepatitis B and Liver Transplantation: Molecular and Clinical Features that Influence Recurrence and Outcome

Reviewer code: 02462702

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2014-02-22 19:50

Date reviewed: 2014-02-22 22:49

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is a nicely written comprehensive review article. Some minor comments for consideration: 1. Abstract, Results: it appears more like the introductory paragraph then results. The authors should consider to put more information, e.g. those presented in the Tables, in this section. 2. Table 1: please delete the right column as it is empty.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 9655

Title: Hepatitis B and Liver Transplantation: Molecular and Clinical Features that Influence Recurrence and Outcome

Reviewer code: 00012051

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2014-02-22 19:50

Date reviewed: 2014-03-11 17:54

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The review entitled " Hepatitis B and Liver Transplantation: Molecular and Clinical Features that Influence Recurrence and Outcome" by T Ghaziani et al, is an overview that may be useful in the field. It is well written and broad up the discussion about HBV and liver transplantation. There is one paragraph about double promoter mutation of HBV whose relevance in the outcome of liver transplantation is not established that is probably not necessary. On the opposite, nothing is said about lymphocytes potentially being a reservoir of HBV causing re infection in the grafted liver.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 9655

Title: Hepatitis B and Liver Transplantation: Molecular and Clinical Features that Influence Recurrence and Outcome

Reviewer code: 02860538

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2014-02-22 19:50

Date reviewed: 2014-03-12 07:14

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[] Grade A (Excellent)	[] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[] Accept
[] Grade B (Very good)	[Y] Grade B: minor language polishing	[] Existed	[] High priority for publication
[] Grade C (Good)	[] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[] No records	[] Rejection
[Y] Grade D (Fair)	[] Grade D: rejected	[] Existed	[] Minor revision
[] Grade E (Poor)		[] No records	[Y] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Ghaziani and colleagues have provided a review detailing the pre and post operative issues of liver transplantation for chronic hepatitis B virus (HBV) infection. Issues discussed include the specific treatment of HBV infection prior to transplantation, primary indications for transplantation surgery and treatment options following surgery. The prognosis for patients following liver transplantation remains difficult to define. This is likely due to a number of factors including the treatment modality and the specific aetiology of the indicators for transplantation (ie. decompensated liver disease vs. hepatocellular carcinoma). The current manuscript attempts to highlight some of these issues; however there are several points which need to be considered prior to publication. These are outlined below; 1. There is no doubt that this review attempts to address a clinically relevant issue; that being the issues surrounding recurrence of HBV infection following liver transplantation. However, the overall message being delivered is not clear. My recommendation would be a restructuring of the current review to discuss those issues which currently impact on survival/disease recurrence post liver transplantation. This could be broken into molecular and clinical factors (as per the current review). While the history of treatment is interesting, it is less relevant to the current topic and detracts from the main message. 2. There is a brief section detailing genetic mutations in HBV which are proposed to impact on disease progression (and presumably indication for transplantation). However, this section details only those mutations described by the authors. Many other papers, some cited in other sections of the current review, have also investigated the role of mutation in HBV disease progression. A more balanced approach is required. 3. There are also some issues regarding consistency of language and grammar throughout

the review and I note that all authors are listed as contributing equally to the manuscript. A recommendation would be for one author to take sole responsibility for editing the final version of the manuscript before submission. This will significantly improve the cohesiveness of the article. Additionally there are some minor issues which require addressing in revision of the current manuscript; - The abstract in its current form is not suitable for publication for a review article. Please refer to other review articles for a more suitable structure for your abstract. This should not be separated into Aim, Methods, Results and Conclusions. My recommendation would be to include a more cohesive abstracts which highlights the more important features of the current review. - Abbreviations are inconsistent. The terms nucleoside (NS) and nucleotide (NT) are introduced and not repeated. Please conform to the standardised nomenclature for HBV therapeutics throughout (nucleos/tide analogue (NA)) - There is an empty column in Table one - Please take care when referring to the HBV polymerase as an RNA polymerase. Typically this would be referred to as a DNA polymerase.