

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 26492

Title: Metabolic complications in liver transplant recipients

Reviewer's code: 00053888

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-04-14 09:18

Date reviewed: 2016-04-14 17:29

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 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		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 evidence surrounding metabolic syndrome post liver transplant. This is a worthwhile and interesting review that clearly demonstrates the prevalence and consequence of the problem. The manuscript is well structured and easy to read but would benefit from a figure &/or table to break up the text.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 26492

Title: Metabolic complications in liver transplant recipients

Reviewer's code: 02941521

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-04-14 09:18

Date reviewed: 2016-04-23 03:43

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

The authors present a manuscript highlighting prevalence and potential complications of metabolic syndrome in liver transplant recipients. I would make the following suggestions 1. In the introduction section the rate of post-transplant metabolic syndrome should be properly referenced to the 4-5 articles evaluating it 2. In the second section the regarding the components, the section on Obesity should be revised. The section starts with weight gain after surgery, then progresses in the same paragraph to discuss pretransplant complications of obesity. It should be organized better so the reader can easily figure out if the authors are discussing pre or post transplant obesity. 3. In addition to above, in the obesity section the authors should clarify the sentence showing data from reference 21- it should be clear the authors are discussing pretransplant BMI, otherwise it makes no sense why they are discussing ascites in post transplant patients 4. In the section on hypertension the authors should not state calcium channel blockers are the treatment of choice and then later exclude all but one. They should just recommend amlodipine/nifedipine and then describe the limitations of the other agents 5. In the section on post transplant diabetes, the authors should be careful as many observations are the prevalence of DM increases after liver transplant. The



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>

statement that liver transplant resolves up to 70% of pretransplant DM based on a single small series examining hepatic insulin resistance leaves the impression that this is mostly a pretransplant problem.

6. Under section 4 discussing repercussions of PTMS, section 4.4 discussing NAFLD could be expanded

7. Finally, the conclusion paragraph should be labeled separately

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 26492

Title: Metabolic complications in liver transplant recipients

Reviewer's code: 02845129

Reviewer's country: Germany

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-04-14 09:18

Date reviewed: 2016-04-29 15:07

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

This paper highlights the important topic of post liver transplant metabolic complications. Overall it is written nicely and is understandable for the reader. It is clearly structured. I have some remarks that should be addressed by the authors: 1. the description of the single aspects of the metabolic syndrom should clearly differnciate between pre and post transplant Situations. Furthermore associations of pre and post transplant conditions should be discussed and literature cited as far as available or a statement given that such data is not available. 2. Overall the utilization of modern steroid free and minimized immunosuppression protocols should be kept in mind. In my understanding maintenance immunosuppression is rarely using steroids in Liver Transplantation and is based on tacrolimus in Most centers. 3. i do n?tig understand the statement on page 6 of the manuscript that deceased donors have more favourable characteristics regarding age, bmi, or Liver function compared to dcds, which usually have less comorbidity.....? 4. the authors should suggest an explanation why incidences of cva are lower than in heart or kidney recipients (page9). Levels of immunosuppression ? 5. the authors should be careful to discuss any positive effect of hepatitis c on lipid metabolism (Page 10) with all the known problems of a hepatitis c (re-) infection. Instead the new treatment options of



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>

hepatitis c might be of interest in these contexts. 6. a treatment Algorithm and target values for the different aspects of ms would be of high interest for the reader. 7. do the authors know of any Data that suggests any reduction of morbidity and mortality after treatment of the ms after liver transplantation?