



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 35679

**Title:** The first case of cross-auxiliary double domino donor liver transplantation

**Reviewer's code:** 03261461

**Reviewer's country:** Egypt

**Science editor:** Ke Chen

**Date sent for review:** 2017-08-21

**Date reviewed:** 2017-08-24

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" 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"/> 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 checked="" 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"/> No	

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The FAP patient( recipient) is some times recognized as "host" in the manuscript and in other paragraphs as "recipient" . It will be better to standardize . 2- The blood group of the recipient and 2 donors as well as the GRWR (graft recipient weight ratio) for each grafts is not mentioned 3- the follow up 258 days includes only the liver profile , copper and ammonia. If the authors have more data about her follow up cardiac and neurological condition it will be great!



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 35679

**Title:** The first case of cross-auxiliary double domino donor liver transplantation

**Reviewer’s code:** 02440467

**Reviewer’s country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Ke Chen

**Date sent for review:** 2017-08-21

**Date reviewed:** 2017-08-24

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"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" 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	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Thank you for inviting me to review this article. The paper is an interesting description of extremely challenging multiple surgical procedures with the aim to perform a cross over domino liver grafts among three patients affected by metabolic liver diseases. The first adult patient was affected by FAB and receive a living donor graft from her mother, the second one was a child affected by Wilson disease, and the third was a child patient affected by OTCD. The Authors' description of the procedures is quite confusing since “graft, host, and recipient” are used in a general term and do not identify exactly which is the patient, which is the graft, which is the host. Graft, host, recipients and different kind of procedures for each single patient are not clearly described. For instance, the AA state: “Donor 1 received the left lateral liver lobe from her mother on September 16, 2013. The domino auxiliary liver transplantation was performed at the same time”; the question is “auxiliary” from which donor, the FAP liver ? The description needs clarification, may also be using a simple numerical identification of 3 patients. Without



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

clear identification of the patient, graft, and techniques, this paper is hardly understandable also for those surgeons with specific experience in domino liver transplantation. The different cross over of the auxiliary grafts should be better clarified, if they come from FAP, from Wilson or OTCD. My question is why the AA didn't split the FAP liver in the same day utilizing the liver machine perfusion in order to have an extra time to proceed to two liver transplantations? In my opinion, the paper requires a detailed schematic drawing as in Fig 3 for each single patient who should be identified with a detailed description of the procedure performed for each single patient. More information about early and medium term follow up is necessary above all for vascular and biliary complications of two pediatric patients.



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 35679

**Title:** The first case of cross-auxiliary double domino donor liver transplantation

**Reviewer's code:** 03294293

**Reviewer's country:** Turkey

**Science editor:** Ke Chen

**Date sent for review:** 2017-08-21

**Date reviewed:** 2017-08-31

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"/> [ ] No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

congratulations. This is a well designed and written case report.



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 35679

**Title:** The first case of cross-auxiliary double domino donor liver transplantation

**Reviewer’s code:** 03011757

**Reviewer’s country:** Australia

**Science editor:** Ke Chen

**Date sent for review:** 2017-08-21

**Date reviewed:** 2017-08-31

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 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input 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 type="checkbox"/> No	

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Review on the manuscript “The first case of cross-auxiliary double domino liver transplantation” The authors of this manuscript describe the successful transplantation of two domino grafts from children into one adult in two stages. They therefore describe a rarely performed procedure, which makes this case interesting for publication. There are some minor points: • The title states that it is the first case reported, however, the authors cite another published case report in their manuscript (Transplant Proc. 2016 Oct;48(8):2738-2741. doi: 10.1016/j.transproceed.2016.07.031.) Please keep the title more neutral and take out first • More information on the surgical part would be interesting – cold ischemia time, time of surgery of the 1st implant and of the 2nd implant Please correct: • Introduction: Line 3: some types, maple syrup urine disease or Methylmalonic academia; Line 5: Domino liver donor graft, last sentence: has been reported • Case report: Both of them were not optimal domino donors...; • Clarify that the 2nd liver transplantation was performed one month after the other one •



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

Discussion: avoiding small for size syndrome; Extending the orifice of the right hepatic vein....; small children; • Take out that this is the first report in the discussion