

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25720

**Title:** How important is donor age in liver transplantation?

**Reviewer's code:** 00053888

**Reviewer's country:** United Kingdom

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-03-22 18:19

**Date reviewed:** 2016-03-23 00:49

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input 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 checked="" 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 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 have reviewed the published literature on the impact of donor age of graft survival following liver transplant. The manuscript is thorough & well written, it is a little bit 'Spain' focussed and the 3 figures might be changed to try & address this problem. In addition the manuscript starts with an introduction & then moves into a small number of sub-headings but does not really finish, it sort of 'fades out'. This could be remedied by inserting a short discussion/conclusion section.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25720

**Title:** How important is donor age in liver transplantation?

**Reviewer's code:** 02936408

**Reviewer's country:** Turkey

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-03-22 18:19

**Date reviewed:** 2016-03-29 04:28

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" 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"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[ Y ] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[ Y ] No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

First of all, the manuscript is too long. It is like a book chapter and it should be shortened properly. Many informative sentences should be omitted in order to refrain repetition. Moreover, minor language polishing is need for a favorable paper.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25720

**Title:** How important is donor age in liver transplantation?

**Reviewer's code:** 03479176

**Reviewer's country:** South Korea

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-03-22 18:19

**Date reviewed:** 2016-03-29 16:10

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 checked="" 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 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

Mostly, this manuscript is well written and reads very well. I am very grateful for the authors' great efforts to write this manuscript that provide international readers with the importance of donors' age in the liver transplantation field. However, some minor revisions are needed to improve the quality of this manuscript and to promote the readers' understanding of this manuscript. In the section "LIVER AGE AS A RISK FACTOR IN LIVER TRANSPLANT COMPLICATIONS", the authors explained the effects of donor age on liver transplantation complications using 2 subsections ("Biliary complications" and "HCV reinfection"). By doing this, the section reads more easily than the other sections. However, in the other sections, no subsection is found. For example, in the section "IMPACT OF DONOR AGE ON LIVER TRANSPLANT OUTCOMES", I recommend the authors to use 2 subsections which are "Deceased donor" and "Living donor", because the outcomes of LTs using grafts from living donors seem favorable compared to those of LTs using grafts from deceased donors. In this way, the authors can divide the other sections into subsections. -Introduction Figure 1: The colors of bar segments representing ranges of age are not easily distinguishable. Please, use a variety of colors like in the other figures rather than use gray-white tone. -Impact of donor age on

liver transplantation Table 1 and 2 summarize the 2 sections, "DONOR AGE AS RISK FACTOR IN PROGNOSTIC SCORES" and "LIVER REGENERATION AND AGING" and provide the essential contents of each section. Unlike these 2 sections, the section "IMPACT OF DONOR AGE ON LIVER TRANSPLANT OUTCOMES", which is relatively long and consists of many paragraphs each of which corresponds to a single study, does not have a table that summarizes its contents. By using a table which carries the demographic data and outcomes of each study, the author will be able to make the section more comprehensible. In the 3rd paragraph, it was stated that "LT performed with living donors  $\leq 30$  years old resulted in better function and regeneration tests within the first month than those performed with donors  $> 50$  years of age". In this sentence, living donors more than 30 years old resulted in better function and "regeneration tests". I think that "regeneration tests" was mistakenly used instead of "regeneration rates".

-Donor age as risk factor in prognostic scores  
Table 1: Please, define the abbreviations that were not defined including the name of Models. As you know, tables should be independent from the manuscript. The references that correspond to the predicting models are also recommended to be cited. According to the 1st paragraph of the section, Feng et al. identified nine donor factors. However, when I count the number of the factors, it is 8, not 9. The authors had better show readers the advantages as well as limitations of each model by comparing them rather than describe each of them independently.

-Liver age as a risk factor in liver transplant complications  
In this section, the authors showed several odds ratio for some variables. In addition to the values of odds ratio, it seems good to show their confidence intervals and p-values. The authors showed the results of "multivariate analysis" and "logistic regression" by citing their own research. What kind of "multivariate analysis" was performed? Multivariate logistic regression? Which type of "logistic regression" was performed, univariate or multivariate logistic regression? The authors should describe the results of statistical analyses in an appropriate way.

-References  
I could find the misspelling of "and" in the reference No. 61. It was misspelled as "ans".