

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 81713

Title: Changes in characteristics of patients with hepatitis C virus-related cirrhosis from

the beginning of the interferon-free era

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06347039 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Pakistan

Author's Country/Territory: Poland

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-21

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-22 03:46

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-07 07:37

Review time: 15 Days and 3 Hours

| Scientific quality | [] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish |
|--------------------|--|
| Language quality | [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection |
| Conclusion | [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection |
| Re-review | [Y]Yes []No |



https://www.wjgnet.com

| Peer-reviewer | Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous | |
|---------------|--|--|
| statements | Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No | |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The Brzdęk et al conducted an observational study to investigate the changes in patient profile, effectiveness, and safety in the HCV-infected cirrhotic Polish population in the IFN-free era. Overall the study is quiet confusing and need major revision. Some of the comments are given below 1. As the study was conducted on Polish population and the title is not representing the main idea of the study 2. In introduction some paragraphs are very short and incomplete 3. I am not able to understand the aims of the study 4. Methodology is poorly written and is very confusing. 5. You have taken 15161 patients as mentioned in study population. This number is different in results (Figure 1) 6. Questionnaire was evaluated among CHC patients. So all the patients were recovered from CHC? No death was reported? 7. Limitation of the study is not mentioned 8. Some of the findings in the results are not clear and vague 9. The data may vary due to available patients in a particular year. It should be mentioned as one of the limitation of the study 10. Graphical presentation of the findings is very poor. It is recommended to use Graphpad prism or any other software



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 81713

Title: Changes in characteristics of patients with hepatitis C virus-related cirrhosis from

the beginning of the interferon-free era

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06197162 Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Director

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: Poland

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-21

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-27 02:10

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-30 01:35

Review time: 2 Days and 23 Hours

| | [] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: |
|---|--|
| Scientific quality | Good |
| | [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish |
| Novelty of this manuscript | [] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty |
| Creativity or innovation of this manuscript | [] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No creativity or innovation |
| | |



| Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript | [] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance |
|--|--|
| Language quality | [Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection |
| Conclusion | [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection |
| Re-review | []Yes [Y]No |
| Peer-reviewer statements | Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript demonstrated clearly the serial changes of profiles in DAAs therapy for CHC with liver cirrhosis in Poland during these seven years. The authors' findings are informative and useful in clinical settings. However, there might be several issues to be solved for further considerations. Major points: 1) The authors did not collect adherence to DAAs therapy in this study. However, for example, in SOF/LDV regimen, there were previous reports that therapy discontinuation would be unfavorable factors for SVR, especially in elder patients (JGH open. 2018;2:300-6; Hepatol Res 2021;51:417-25). Although the reviewer recognized the authors' excuse of limitations of this study, please add some comments in Discussion. 2) As for Reference #30, the reviewer believes that it's not appropriate to cite unpublished data. In particular, the authors should avoid the duplicate the data of the same retrospective cohort. 3) The reviewer understands that this manuscript was written in descriptive fashion, however more concise expressions might be desirable in scientific journals.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 81713

Title: Changes in characteristics of patients with hepatitis C virus-related cirrhosis from

the beginning of the interferon-free era

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06480331 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Reader (Associate Professor)

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Poland

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-21

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-27 01:38

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-04 11:55

Review time: 8 Days and 10 Hours

| | [] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Scientific quality | Good |
| | [Y] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish |
| Novelty of this manuscript | [] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty |
| Creativity or innovation of | [] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair |
| this manuscript | [] Grade D: No creativity or innovation |



| Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript | [] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance |
|--|--|
| Language quality | [] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection |
| Conclusion | [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection |
| Re-review | [Y]Yes []No |
| Peer-reviewer statements | Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript introduces changes in characteristics of HCV patient and IFN free therapy regimens along with their effectiveness and safety profile over 7 years. This observational study with a large sample size is very interesting. However, there were some major issues which need to be addressed. 1.Quality of the writing needs to be improved and introduction section with poor organization is suggested to be rewritten, e.g., gather the first and second paragraphs together. Moreover, some references were missing in this section. It's hard for me to give more comments on this manuscript due to the lack of line numbers. 2.The quality of the figures (Figure2-5) is not satisfactory, e.g., In Figure2, it is better to gather the Figure 2B-2F to show the findings like Figure2A. 3.There is a lack of results of statistical analyses in Table1-4 and Figure3. 4.I am less clear about what is already known on the topic and what this study adds. How this observational study with HCV infected patients might affect clinical practice? 5.Please highlight the limitations of the study.