

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 19716

Title: Liver transplantation and sleeve gastrectomy in the medically complicated obese: New challenges on the horizon

Reviewer's code: 00054102

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-05-19 17:36

Date reviewed: 2015-05-22 13:13

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[Y] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[] Grade B: Very good	[] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[] The same title	[] High priority for publication
[] Grade C: Good	[] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[] Duplicate publication	[] Rejection
[] Grade D: Fair	[] Grade D: Rejected	[Y] No	[] Minor revision
[] Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	[] Major revision
		[] The same title	
		[] Duplicate publication	
		[] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a very interesting manuscript about an ongoing relevant issue. The manuscript is well written and comments are very relevant. I would like only to comment to the authors a couple of questions. Firstly, could you comment on which BMI would you recommend to be indication to add a SG to LT, specially in case of patients with metabolic syndrome? Secondly, at the view of current experience, could you make any proposal of the timing of SG depending on the severity of liver disease? It seems that any patient without indication for LT or compensated liver disease may benefit of SG previously to LT. And, in the other hand, we could agree that decompensated patients should not undergo SG previous to LT, but consider it simultaneoulsy. Could you further comment on this aspect? Which would be your opinion?

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 19716

Title: Liver transplantation and sleeve gastrectomy in the medically complicated obese: New challenges on the horizon

Reviewer's code: 00053958

Reviewer's country: Canada

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-05-19 17:36

Date reviewed: 2015-05-25 07:57

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" 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 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 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

This is a well-written editorial on a very important emerging issue facing liver transplantation. I have 2 minor comments: 1) Can the authors comment on the effects of sleeve gastrectomy in someone who may require LT in the future- in terms of changes to the surgical field? 2) In the conclusion, I think the term 'reverse transcriptase inhibitors' should be changed to DAA (Direct acting antivirals).

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 19716

Title: Liver transplantation and sleeve gastrectomy in the medically complicated obese: New challenges on the horizon

Reviewer's code: 00053490

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-05-19 17:36

Date reviewed: 2015-05-30 04:50

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google 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"/> 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

The authors submitted an editorial piece discussing the utility of weight loss surgery in the setting of liver transplantation. The authors have done a nice job summarizing the literature. I have a few comments: 1. In the authors' first paragraph, it appears reference 2 is cited before reference 1. These should be reversed. 2. In the second paragraph, the sentence stating that NASH cirrhosis as the primary indication for liver transplantation is confusing. Do the authors mean that the incidence has increased from 1.2% to 9.7%, or do the authors mean that the incidence ranges between 1.2% and 9.7%? This was unclear to me. 3. The authors used a lot of acronyms, and most are defined. Some are not, however. Most of them may be obvious, but still should be defined (e.g., ICU=intensive care unit; HCV=hepatitis C; US=United States; BMI=body mass index). 4. On page 8, the paragraph implies there are several factors involved in why the Heimbach study was significant. They start a sentence with "First, ..." However, subsequent sentences do not use a "second" or "next." This paragraph construction is awkward. Likewise, the last sentence of the following paragraph that goes onto page 9 is also awkwardly constructed. 5. The final paragraph



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

prior to the conclusion paragraph states that "More importantly, they were able to tolerate a major bariatric surgery without any overt decompensation of their newly diagnosed liver disease." I would submit that patients with stage 2 fibrosis will tolerate major surgery. Even well compensated Childs A cirrhotics (no evidence of portal hypertension) can tolerate major surgery, so patients with only stage 2 fibrosis should be able to tolerate surgery. I think the authors' sentence might be worded too strongly. 6. In the conclusion, the authors comment that NASH cirrhosis will "supersede all other indications for LT in the near future." Although this may be a true statement, the authors never cited any references in the body of the editorial to support this conclusion. Although this manuscript is an editorial, it seems that the above statement should be based on some fact presented somewhere in the manuscript.