

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 73493

**Title:** Correlation of the pressure gradient in three hepatic veins with the portal pressure gradient

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 00071220

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Japan

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-11-26

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-11-26 05:19

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-11-26 05:36

**Review time:** 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

I had the opportunity to review a paper "Correlation of the pressure gradient in the three hepatic veins with the portal pressure gradient", and I found very interesting. There is no problem to publish the manuscript.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 73493

**Title:** Correlation of the pressure gradient in three hepatic veins with the portal pressure gradient

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 01490498

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** FRCP, MBChB, MD

**Professional title:** Attending Doctor, Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United Kingdom

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-11-26

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-11-29 06:56

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-12-06 22:07

**Review time:** 7 Days and 15 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="radio"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="radio"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This study is unfortunately severely flawed due to a mixture of patients with and without cirrhosis. All patients MUST have cirrhosis and therefore the data on haemodynamic studies is meaningless. Also, patients with cholestatic disease must be excluded as they could have a pre-sinusoidal component. Moreover, the PPG does not appear to be the porto-caval gradient as both IVC and RA pressure were used. PPG is PVP- IVC pressure. The language needs much polishing and sometimes the paper reads like a lab manual rather than proper prose.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 73493

**Title:** Correlation of the pressure gradient in three hepatic veins with the portal pressure gradient

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06118556

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor, Staff Physician

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-11-26

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-11-27 06:12

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-12-08 15:14

**Review time:** 11 Days and 9 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors present an interesting series of patients undergoing tips procedure, that provides an interesting comparison between real pressure values and indirect estimates. From my expert opinion this work is original and try to answer a dilemma in the clinical practice. However I have many concerns about the manuscript provided that in my opinion needs to be largely rewritten: - English is inadequate and must be reviewed by a native english speaker. English is awful in some parts, unreadable. - The abstract, and in particular the results section must be rewritten and simplified. To many data are reported. I suggest the authors to focus and to stress the most relevant results. - The manuscript must strictly adhere to the scheme introduction, material and methods, results and conclusion. There is confusion between introduction and methods without adequate subheadings. - The introduction is not well argued. More references should be provided. "There are few articles on whether HVPG accurately represents PPG in real-world measurements" needs bibliography. - Entry criteria should be inclusion criteria - TIPS indication patients is not correct in English neither represent an acceptable inclusion criterum. Maybe the authors intend variceal bleeding and refractory ascites? Do they consider other indications for TIPS? - Exclusion criteria: "Tumor patients" sounds horrible; "Patients with portal vein thrombosis affecting blood flow (generally more than 1/2 of the diameter of the main portal vein)" what do the authors mean with generally? it depends on what? - Results are unreadable. The authors should provide all the results in tables and highlight the most relevant findings in the text. - discussion: the authors should spend more words on the underestimation of the HVPG in specific types of liver pathology (such as presinusoidal portal hypertension). Also,



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

they should investigate the accuracy of HVPG in different etiologies of portal hypertension

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 73493

**Title:** Correlation of the pressure gradient in three hepatic veins with the portal pressure gradient

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 00034151

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** FAASLD, MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** South Korea

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-11-26

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-11-29 04:28

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-12-09 02:36

**Review time:** 9 Days and 22 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors investigated and reported the correlation between the pressure gradient of the hepatic veins and the portal pressure gradient. The subject is clinically relevant and interesting, however, there are major drawbacks as follows (but not limited to):

- For accurate interpretation of the hemodynamic findings, detailed analyses of anatomic variations of vessels (such as anatomy of hepatic veins, etc.; intrahepatic vascular abnormalities such as shunts, etc.; portal vein abnormalities such as portal vein thrombosis, collateral vessel development, etc.), characteristics of parenchymal liver (such as volume differences among lobes and segments) should be analyzed.
- For accurate interpretation of the hemodynamic findings, detailed analysis of the characteristics by etiology should be addressed (in considering that there were 14 cases of hepatic vein occlusion syndrome and 4 cases of hepatic sinusoidal occlusion syndrome).
- For accurate interpretation of the hemodynamic findings, detailed analysis of the clinical information including medication history should be addressed.
- There are many typographical, grammatical errors in the manuscript including references.

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 73493

**Title:** Correlation of the pressure gradient in three hepatic veins with the portal pressure gradient

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06118556

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor, Staff Physician

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-11-26

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jia-Ru Fan

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-01-27 12:48

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-01-30 18:06

**Review time:** 3 Days and 5 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The backgroud section of the abstract needs to be synthesized. Conclusions must be succint, coming to the point. This paragraph should be improved.