

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25824

**Title:** PREDICTIVE FACTORS OF SHORT TERM OUTCOME AFTER LIVER TRANSPLANTATION: A REVIEW

**Reviewer's code:** 02461826

**Reviewer's country:** Austria

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2016-03-24 17:49

**Date reviewed:** 2016-04-11 02:37

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 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 checked="" 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 present review summarizes the current knowledge on risk factors for short term outcome including initial poor function and primary non-function of liver allografts after transplantation in adults. The present work is well structured and concisely written. Minor comments: - The short title is misleading and should be rephrased - Although this review focuses on predictors of short term outcome assessed after transplantation it would benefit from a more concise presentation on how pretransplant scores like MELD, MELD-Na etc might impact on the outcome after liver transplantation. - I don't agree with the first sentence of the abstract "Liver transplantation represents the only therapeutic solution to primary liver cancer and end-stage liver disease." - LT is not the only therapeutic solution. This should be changed or specified. - There are some phrases that are unclear and need some language polishing and correction of typos.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25824

**Title:** PREDICTIVE FACTORS OF SHORT TERM OUTCOME AFTER LIVER TRANSPLANTATION: A REVIEW

**Reviewer's code:** 00053888

**Reviewer's country:** United Kingdom

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2016-03-24 17:49

**Date reviewed:** 2016-04-11 19:26

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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<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 attempted to review all of the various means of predicting outcome after liver transplant. There are a significant number of systems that have been tested and this in itself explains why none of them are perfect. The authors have shied away from any recommendations in their conclusion and rightly so. The manuscript is very long and a little unwieldy for the average reader. The authors should be encouraged to reduce the length of the manuscript and provide the readers with a break from the text by using the odd figure. In general terms this type of review would be a welcome addition to the published literature.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25824

**Title:** PREDICTIVE FACTORS OF SHORT TERM OUTCOME AFTER LIVER TRANSPLANTATION: A REVIEW

**Reviewer's code:** 00053950

**Reviewer's country:** Finland

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2016-03-24 17:49

**Date reviewed:** 2016-04-26 21:11

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"/> 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper is interesting and the authors have made a great effort to put together all possible parameters in evaluating the short term outcome after liver transplantation. It is well known that the outcome is difficult to estimate on the basis of any single parameter because of the heterogeneity of incidences influencing on the outcome. The outcome depends on the basic illness of the patient, possible infections, concomitant diseases, previous operations, and medication. In addition, the outcome may be donor- dependent or influenced by technical factors and both CIT and WIT, as well. Thus it even looks a bit arbitrary to try to find any single or even combination of markers in evaluating the outcome. On the other hand, the predictive factors of the outcome would be of benefit only if it had influence on the selection of the donor. Thus, the clinical impression of the recovery will still be the mainstay of decisions concerning the treatment of the patient. Nevertheless, it is valuable to estimate possible forthcoming problems in advance. Remarks: - The paper consists of 7700 words the refs and tables excluded. Thus, the paper is all too extensive and should be revised in order to be more readable. - The construction of the subtitles does not follow the instructions of the journal. -



## 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](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

Abstract. The first sentence is untrue. There are many therapeutic alternatives to HCC in addition to LT. - Introduction. The incidences of IPF of 29.5% and of PNF of 14.1% are far too high to be acceptable. Such high figures can be seen only in centers of poorly functioning LT program. - Chapter 2. Preoperative scores...is too extensive as the same information is given later in the text. - It may be a bit clumsy to divide the use parameters in pre-, intra- and postoperative periods. Thus, same parameters are presented twice or even three times. - Postoperative scoring systems in evaluating the outcome should be presented more briefly because they are preferably used in evaluation of critically ill non-transplanted ICU patients. - Conclusion should be shorter. - There are 40-50 refs too many. - The oldest refs should be removed from table 1. - Table 2 should be revised to a shorter form.