

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Hepatology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 20038

**Title:** Defining acute-on-chronic liver failure: East, west or middle ground?

**Reviewer's code:** 02861252

**Reviewer's country:** Turkey

**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian

**Date sent for review:** 2015-05-30 15:29

**Date reviewed:** 2015-06-11 06:05

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] 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"/> [ Y] No	<input 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 type="checkbox"/> [ Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I hope too, that future studies will enroll patients as per this definition so that patients falling the different sub-categories with possible different outcomes can be compared and more useful data would emerge thereby.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Hepatology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 20038

**Title:** Defining acute-on-chronic liver failure: East, west or middle ground?

**Reviewer's code:** 00050424

**Reviewer's country:** Greece

**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian

**Date sent for review:** 2015-05-30 15:29

**Date reviewed:** 2015-07-01 04:00

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input 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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	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

It is a well written and comprehensive article that analyzes all the differences in the definitions on ACLF between APASL and EASL-CLIF consortium. Please correct : Acute viral hepatitis A or E as the acute insult also differed between.... the two ...the two studies (33.3% and 7% respectively) [22,24].