ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology
ESPS Manuscript NO: 3989
Title: Prognostic factors in non-malignant and non-cirrhotic patients with portal cavernoma
Reviewer code: 00005584
Science editor: Zhai, Huan-Huan
Date sent for review: 2013-06-07 18:34
Date reviewed: 2013-06-18 16:42

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is an interesting review of portal cavernoma evolution. I have some comments: 1. Acute thrombotic episode is defined. But I doubt if these patients have cavernoma too. Are t patients with cavernoma with an adding thrombotic episode? 2. How many patients finally were their liver biopsed? Sometimes it is not easy a diagnosis of cirrhosis vs. secondary changes due to chronic portal vein thombosis. 3. Was etiology study in a protocolized manner? This protocol should be explained in methods. 4. Was anticoagulaton a prognosis factor? And how many patients were finally anticoagulated. It is not shown in tables. 5. I do not understand why leukocyte count is a bad prognostic factor. Did these patients have a myeloprolipherative disorder? 6. In view of the number of deaths (7) I think that a a multivariate regresion cox analysis is not possible. I would eliminate this or I will discuss that the model is overfitted and conlusions of this analysis sholud be taken with caution.