

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 36146

Title: Comparison of tolvaptan and furosemide in cirrhotic ascites patients who had insufficient responses to conventional therapy: a randomized study

Reviewer's code: 02456449

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Ke Chen

Date sent for review: 2017-09-14

Date reviewed: 2017-09-22

Review time: 8 Days

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 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 type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1.I think the the follow-up period of the study (7 days) is short, and it is not sufficient to evaluate the effects of treatment with tolvaptan for cirrhotic ascites and give the convincing conclusion. Therefore, I suggest that the follow-up period ought to be more than 4 weeks, and the effects should be respectively evaluated in 1,2,3 and 4 weeks.
2.Patients included in this study had normal renal function, but hepatorenal syndrome may affect the response to diuretics and tolvaptan. The results would likely have been different.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 36146

Title: Comparison of tolvaptan and furosemide in cirrhotic ascites patients who had insufficient responses to conventional therapy: a randomized study

Reviewer's code: 02942666

Reviewer's country: Pakistan

Science editor: Ke Chen

Date sent for review: 2017-09-14

Date reviewed: 2017-09-24

Review time: 10 Days

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 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 type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Manuscript NO: 36146 Title: Comparison of tolvaptan and furosemide in cirrhotic ascites patients who had insufficient responses to conventional therapy: a randomized study

Manuscript Type: Randomized Controlled Trial Reviewer comments: A. General

Title: The manuscripts title is metaphorical it should be clearer and rephrased B. Specific Abstract: 1. The aim of any study should be reflected in the title. In

abstract section aims should be clearly defined and should matches with title. 2.

Abstract should be rephrased and brief methodology should be included. 3.

Conclusion should be more comprehensive. Introduction: Authors should

include more substance about resistant ascites and refractory ascites. Role of

Aquaretics should be discussed in case of both resistant and refractory ascites. These

additions will make the rationale more appealing. Methodology:



**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

1. Authors should define an ineffective diuretic response. The refractory ascites is defined as immobilization of free fluid from peritoneum despite 160 mg or aldactone of 400mg. The refractory ascites is further divided into diuretic resistant or diuretic intractable.
2. How $\geq 20\text{mg}$ furosemide and $\geq 25\text{ mg}$ aldactone for Diuresis explains ineffective diuretic response, as the role of aquaretics is more pronounced in diuretic resistant ascites and dilutional Hyponatremia.
3. Although authors have given mean CTP score in table but all enrolled cirrhotics should be classified into CTP stages. This severity classification would further clear the role of aquaretics.
4. Stages of ascites should be determined as it would further help to understand effective role of aquaretics in each stage of ascites.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 36146

Title: Comparison of tolvaptan and furosemide in cirrhotic ascites patients who had insufficient responses to conventional therapy: a randomized study

Reviewer's code: 02941569

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Ke Chen

Date sent for review: 2017-09-14

Date reviewed: 2017-09-28

Review time: 14 Days

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"/> 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 study is interesting and generally well designed and conducted. However, there're some problems need to be noted: 1. Sample size in this study is small and how to calculate the required number is not very clear in section "Statistical analysis"; 2. It will be more clear if changes in ascites volume after the administration of drugs could be displayed in combination with changes in body weight in Figure 1 and Figure 2 as a direct comparison; 3. The occurrence of hyponatremia is an important issue and should be adequately discussed.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 36146

Title: Comparison of tolvaptan and furosemide in cirrhotic ascites patients who had insufficient responses to conventional therapy: a randomized study

Reviewer's code: 03253490

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Ke Chen

Date sent for review: 2017-09-14

Date reviewed: 2017-10-02

Review time: 18 Days

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 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 type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The idea is smart but some issues were raised; 1-The study population is small, 2- The follow up period is short, 3-The discussion part is short, it must be longer and would include current studies about the usage of tolvaptan in cirrhotics

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 36146

Title: Comparison of tolvaptan and furosemide in cirrhotic ascites patients who had insufficient responses to conventional therapy: a randomized study

Reviewer's code: 03476715

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Ke Chen

Date sent for review: 2017-09-14

Date reviewed: 2017-10-04

Review time: 20 Days

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

This is a well-written paper, which tries to assess the effects of treatment with low-dose tolvaptan for cirrhotic ascites. This well-designed clinical trial has some practical value to improve the treatment of cirrhotic ascites.