

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 17022

Title: Allocation of patients with liver cirrhosis and organ failure to intensive care - Systematic review and a proposal for clinical practice

Reviewer's code: 03024216

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-02-10 12:37

Date reviewed: 2015-02-12 02:30

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 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Title: i would change it with "Allocation of patients with liver cirrhosis and organ failure to intensive care units: a systematic review of the literature and a proposal of a scoring system for clinical practice". Abstract: the abstract requires some improvements, both regarding grammar/syntax and the content. For example, you must specify that this is a systematic review of the literature (the term "systematic review" does not adequately explain what has been assessed). Furthermore, the "Methods" section lacks some fundamental information: you should add some details regarding the research methodology (for example, which terms have been used during the search and which inclusion criteria have been chosen to include the articles). Finally, the "Results" section should be more focused on the results actually derived from your systematic review rather than generically describe the SOFA score. Moreover, you should mention your proposed clinical system to identify candidates for ICU. Introduction: there are some grammatical and syntax errors (for example, "ranges from" at line 22 should be changed with "ranges between"). Pay attention to the use of abbreviations (for example, "Intensive Care Unit" at line 9 should be followed by an appropriate abbreviation -

"ICU" - and used in this way in the rest of the text, for example at line 18; "EASL - CLIF" should be explained). Methods: adequate. Results: you must explain the reasons that led to the exclusion of some papers from your literature review (for example, why did you excluded 505 articles "during the initial title screening process"?). "Figure 1" should be put in brackets. Please introduce table 1 before the detailed description of the included studies. Paragraph "Included cohort studies in the field": I would change the title with "Cohort studies". You must delete the term "at our institution" (papers should be as anonymous as possible). You must better specify what you meant with "increasing organ failure" (I assume that you meant the number of organ involved by multi-organ failure). Paragraph "Included reviews within the field": I would change the title with "Reviews". Please specify which "general ICU prognostic scores" and "liver specific scores" have been evaluated in the study by Saliba et al. Paragraph "Scoring systems": you must fully explain the abbreviations "APACHE" and "WHO". Table 2 should be briefly introduced at the top of this paragraph. Table 3 should be introduced at the top of the "Child-Pugh Score" section. The MELD score formula must be better explained. Table 4 should be briefly introduced at the beginning of the "The World Health Organisation Performance Score" section. Please provide a full explanation of the abbreviations included in the "The Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation scores" (for example, "AaDO₂"). You should briefly introduce table 5 at the beginning of the "Sequential Organ Failure Assessment Score" paragraph. What does "MAP" means? Please provide adequate citations for Table 6 and figure 2. Discussion: you should delete all paragraphs from this section. Table 5 presents the CLIF-SOFA score, I can't see any of your "suggested criteria to determine if a patient is a candidate to intensive care". Please provide adequate citations for figure 3 and figure 4. How did you develop your "First-CLASS" software? Which are the literature data Did you test your "scoring system" during clinical practice? If so, which are your results? Tables: table 1 must be completely rewritten, as in the present form it is extremely difficult to understand and cannot be used to extrapolate useful data.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 17022

Title: Allocation of patients with liver cirrhosis and organ failure to intensive care – Systematic review and a proposal for clinical practice

Reviewer's code: 03024171

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-02-10 12:37

Date reviewed: 2015-03-12 23:44

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"/> [Y] 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"/> [] 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

Dear authors In this manuscript “Allocation of patients with liver cirrhosis and organ failure to intensive care – Systematic review and a proposal for clinical practice”, the authors aimed to perform a systematic review regarding allocation of patients with liver cirrhosis to ICU. They also proposed a scoring system to help identify the patients as candidates for ICU therapy. The subject matter of current study is of interest. And the manuscript is written fairly well. This review may help clinicians choose the more suitable treatments. It is suitable for publishing in the journal.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 17022

Title: Allocation of patients with liver cirrhosis and organ failure to intensive care - Systematic review and a proposal for clinical practice

Reviewer's code: 02942858

Reviewer's country: Egypt

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-02-10 12:37

Date reviewed: 2015-03-11 03:39

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 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I think this systematic review is of good quality and deserve publication but it need minor changes first. Find attached file contain the needed correction.

The review article idea is good and the content add new data.

The presentation and readability of the review article is good.

I think this review article is of good quality and deserve publication

Title: is accurately reflects the major topic and contents of this review article

Abstract: it gives a clear delineation of the content and the goal of this review article. It summarizes the inflammatory mechanisms involved in the pathogenesis of HE and evaluates the evidences of current therapies which target the inflammatory pathogenesis of HE in the clinical practice.

The review article: is well written and give new idea on the pathogenesis of hepatic encephalopathy



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>

and new promising therapeutic approaches for cirrhotic patients with HE.