

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 33464

Title: Efficacy and Safety of Directly Acting Antivirals for the Treatment of Chinese Chronic Hepatitis C Patients in a Real-World setting

Reviewer's code: 00053556

Reviewer's country: Egypt

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2017-02-11 22:23

Date reviewed: 2017-02-25 05:41

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"/> 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 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

Comments to the Editor: Thanks for inviting me to review the article entitled "Efficacy and Safety of Directly Acting Antivirals for the Treatment of Chinese Chronic Hepatitis C Patients in a Real-World setting". Comments to the authors: Minor Comment: o Minor editing polishing is required. o Language evaluation: "B". Comments to Authors: 1. TITLE Reflect the major content of the article, however it is better to add the word combined Directly Acting Antivirals, as the combined therapy is the study topic. 2. ABSTRACT o It gives a clear delineation of the research background, o Result section: "significantly higher than baseline levels" is better to be replaced by significantly increased than baseline levels. This has to be corrected. o The aim and the conclusion were clearly identified. o The conclusion provided by the authors was not convincing and has to be revised. This may be because of the small sample size. 3. INTRODUCTION o Provides insufficient background regarding the studied topic, advantages and disadvantages of DAAs were not fully elaborated; the authors has to emphasise the oral use, short duration and minimum toxicity of DAAs. o Meanwhile, cost is still an obstacle in a lot of countries especially developing ones. Also the value of

combined rather than monotherapy is better to be elucidated. o It was mentioned that China has the greatest number of chronic hepatitis C (CHC) cases worldwide. The common genotypes were missing and are better to be mentioned. 4. MATERIALS AND METHODS: Full description is provided for this section. Sufficient experimental data were provided; however, the following remarks have to be considered: o Patients: Total number of patients was missing in this section and has to be added. o HCV genotypes: For the work to be reproducible, more details are better to be mentioned regarding amplification condition as well as PCR product purification and RFLP analyses. 5. RESULTS: An overall theoretical analysis of the study results is well covered. ? Baseline characteristics of enrolled patients: P value is missing. ? Changes of clinical indices before and after DAAs treatment: It was mentioned that ALT and AST levels were significantly lower than baseline levels, although both within the range of normal accepted values. ? AEs during DAAs treatment: "The incidence of AEs during.....: It is the frequency rather than the incidence and this has to be corrected. ? Table (3): It is frequency rather than incidence. This has to be corrected. AEs of 0 values (fever, depression,...) have to be deleted from the table. Their data have been already mentioned within the text. 6. Discussion: The section is almost well organized; however, an overall theoretical analysis concerning the provided data is partially covered. More details are required concerning the evaluated results. 7-REFERENCES: Relevant and sufficient updated references were adequately cited. Ref. (12): The year is missing.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 33464

Title: Efficacy and Safety of Directly Acting Antivirals for the Treatment of Chinese Chronic Hepatitis C Patients in a Real-World setting

Reviewer's code: 02527569

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2017-02-11 22:23

Date reviewed: 2017-02-12 12:44

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

This study summarizes the real-world data when using DAAs against HCV. The data are concisely summarized and no major concerns exist. I have only one comment. In figure 2, the authors showed significant differences but it is hard to believe it because of the relatively large SD. Statistical methods should be re-considered carefully.