

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 31216

Title: Octogenarian liver grafts: Is their use for transplant currently justified?

Reviewer's code: 03117443

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2016-11-21 16:52

Date reviewed: 2016-12-27 03:46

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a great paper that warrants publication and significantly contributes to the existing literature. That said, there are details the authors could add to substantially increase its value. 1) Add specific data on the degree of macro- and microvesicular steatosis actually transplanted. These data should be available as the authors biopsied each allograft. 2) Is a biopsy really necessary? Shouldn't the teaching point be "if the allograft looks and feels good with a good donor chart just go ahead and use it?" The authors advocate for biopsy but this is not without peril as octogenarian livers typically have some element of fibrosis (if not by H&E then electron microscopy) and octogenarian livers are much more prone to biopsy-related liver injuries such as subcapsular hematoma. It is our experience that routine biopsy, particularly pre-recovery, destroys a small single-digit percentage of usable allografts. Can the authors elaborate how the biopsy actually helped in triage. Lastly, what is the authors experience of utilizing a CT to assess atherosclerosis pre-recovery? Or significant donor morbidities like renal failure, cardiac failure, or pre-existing vascular disease (AAA, or non-traumatic extremity amputation)?

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 31216

Title: Octogenarian liver grafts: Is their use for transplant currently justified?

Reviewer's code: 03660289

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2016-11-21 16:52

Date reviewed: 2016-12-01 22:35

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 manuscript analyzes the use of octogenarian donors as a means to expand the liver donor pool. The topic is interesting, given the progressive aging in general population. However, authors fail to clearly communicate the distinctive points of their experience in comparison to the already published material. I have few other questions: 1. Was portal vein flush routinely used also in donors < 65 years? 2. Was acute rejection diagnosed histologically in all cases? 3. Authors should clarify how they estimated graft preservation injury 4. How was the follow-up conducted?



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>

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 31216

Title: Octogenarian liver grafts: Is their use for transplant currently justified?

Reviewer's code: 01560442

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2016-11-21 16:52

Date reviewed: 2016-12-02 00:03

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" 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

The statistic methods in the paper should be revised and reformed.