

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 59789

Title: Simultaneous partial splenectomy during liver transplantation for advanced cirrhosis patients combined with severe splenomegaly and hypersplenism

Reviewer's code: 02552253

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-11-25

Reviewer chosen by: Le Zhang

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-11-30 12:58

Reviewer performed review: 2020-12-01 14:56

Review time: 1 Day and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes, Title clear and complete 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? They are missing 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? The state of the art and the meaning of the study are well explained in the introduction 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Almost. The patients are divided in to two groups: LT with or without partial splenectomy. Were they randomized? Or: what criteria were used to assign a patient to one of the two groups? Fig. 3A and 3B are not cited in the text 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? In table 2 (donor characteristics) 11 cases of brain tumour: which histological type? Results are clear and support the hypothesis of the study even if the cohort of patients is not wide enough to consider fully demonstrated the thesis of the authors 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? The discussion is accurate and exhaustive as well as relevant from a clinical point of view 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? They are OK 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Yes Performing partial

splenectomy associated with LT seems to be an interesting therapeutic option for OLT candidates with cirrhosis and splenomegaly. The results of the study seem to support the choice of partial splenectomy even if the limited number of cases enlisted does not allow a validation of the procedure. A revision of the English language is necessary to make the text more smooth and correct