

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8679

Title: Efficacy of An Immunosuppression Monotherapy to Prevent Rejection after Liver Transplantation: A Meta-Analysis

Reviewer code: 00503228

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2014-01-02 19:54

Date reviewed: 2014-01-03 13:30

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input 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 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	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

- In your keywords, have you not used "CMV or cytomegalovirus" "diabetes, or drug related diabetes mellitus"? - "There were significant effects on the CMV infection (RR..." Please say what of the two groups represented higher frequency of CMV/Diabetes for Tac and CsA.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8679

Title: Efficacy of An Immunosuppression Monotherapy to Prevent Rejection after Liver Transplantation: A Meta-Analysis

Reviewer code: 02542400

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2014-01-02 19:54

Date reviewed: 2014-01-13 16:53

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This study was conducting a systematic review and meta-analysis to assess the advantages and of an immunosuppression with or without steroids after transplantation. This study is not my specialty. However, as a meta-analysis article , which was with the clearly argument, the correct method, and the reliable conclusions.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8679

Title: Efficacy of An Immunosuppression Monotherapy to Prevent Rejection after Liver Transplantation: A Meta-Analysis

Reviewer code: 02823396

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2014-01-02 19:54

Date reviewed: 2014-01-14 02:04

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I have read with great interest this review manuscript focused on the efficacy of an immunosuppression monotherapy to prevent rejection after liver transplantation. I congratulate the authors for this meta-analysis because is solid and with clear conclusions. However, I would desire not only the clinical impact of the different treatments, because adding a cost-effectiveness analysis could solve more questions.