

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 86024

**Title:** Prevention and management of hepatitis B virus reactivation in patients with hematological malignancies in the targeted therapy era

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 00052947

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Director, Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Germany

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-05-29

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-05-31 16:11

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-06-11 16:31

**Review time:** 11 Days

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

General comment The topic of the review is highly relevant and timely. The merit of the review is that it covers the entire spectrum of drugs or therapies against hematologic malignancies. Overall, the text is well organized. The tables are informative, but the layout is partly suboptimal. A weakness is the virtual absent description of the HBV replication and the effect of anti-HBV immune reactions on the course of the infection. A small paragraph on the life cycle with its persistent nuclear cccDNA and the role of immune pathogenesis in acute and chronic hepatitis B. The sensitivity and specificity of the HBV screening tests is not even touched. A further weakness is the inaccurate distinction between HBV infection and HBV induced disease. The nomenclature should be clearer and more consistent. Specific points 1. Title. Spell out HBV in the title 2. The abstract and core tip should more clearly and explicitly mention that inactive and even “resolved” HBV infection leads virtually always to persistence of HBV genomes in the liver. The expression of those silent genomes is controlled by the immune system. Suppression or ablation of immune cells, most importantly B cells may lead to reactivation of seemingly resolved HBV infection. 3. Introduction, 1st sentence. “Patients

with chronic or resolved hepatitis B virus (HBV) infection are at risk of reactivation of the virus if they receive chemotherapy or immunotherapy. “ The nomenclature should be more precise. a. Not all chemotherapies are immunosuppressive. b. Immunotherapy could be used to actively suppress HBV or cancer cells. 4. Virologic factors. “The identified virologic risk factors for include CHB, high baseline HBV DNA levels and hepatitis B e-antigen (HBeAg) positivity”. Again, the wording is unfortunate: a. Risk factor for what? Reactivation or CHB? b. An HBV infection with high HBV DNA and with HBeAg is already very active and cannot be reactivated anymore. However, reactivation of the inactive immune response will lead to an acute flare or even liver failure. 5. The work of Salpini et al (ref. 21) is incorrectly described. There, it is indeed mentioned that 5 mutations were in T cell epitopes but most of the mutations were in the B cell epitopes of the HBs antigenic loop. This is in line with the frequent reactivation under B cell suppressive therapy. 6. “Obinutuzumab is a second-generation anti-CD20 monoclonal antibody. It is a humanized, glycol-engineered type 2 antibody”. There is an embarrassing mistake: It has nothing to do with glycol. It has non-fucosylated sugars on the Fc portion. 7. HBV screening. The text should cover rare cases as well. Fig. 1 is indeed helpful. a. HBsAg may be false negative due to diagnostic escape mutations. b. Anti-HBc may be false negative after a previous B cell depleting therapy. (Gärtner et al. Permanent loss of anti-HBc after reactivation of hepatitis B virus infection in an anti-HBs and anti-HBc-positive patient after allogeneic stem cell transplantation. J Clin Virol. 2007 PMID: 17182277. c. Isolated anti-HBs without anti-HBc may be present in pretreated patients without previous HB vaccination. d. For all three cases a sensitive test for HBV DNA is advisable. 8. HBsAg-positive patients without hepatitis at baseline. The problem here is that the immunosuppressive therapy may initially increase the viral load without ALT rise. However, if immune reconstitution occurs, a fulminant hepatitis may result which cannot be treated with NAT anymore. The same can occur with HBsAg negative



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

patients. 9. CHOICE OF ANTIVIRAL THERAPY. It should be mentioned that previous lamivudine therapy often leads to selection of mutants which may become rapidly resistant to entecavir. Geipel A et al. Entecavir allows an unexpectedly high residual replication of HBV mutants resistant to lamivudine. *Antivir Ther.* 2015;20(8):779-87. PMID: 25560463. 10. Tables 1-5 report the number of deaths caused by reactivation as zero throughout. However, many historical case reports exist with a lethal course of HBV reactivation under immunosuppressive therapy, e.g.: Foont JA, Schiff ER. Avoid the tragedy of hepatitis B reactivation in immunosuppressed patients. *Nat Clin Pract Gastroenterol Hepatol.* 2007 PMID: 17262070.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 86024

**Title:** Prevention and management of hepatitis B virus reactivation in patients with hematological malignancies in the targeted therapy era

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06994672

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** N/A

**Professional title:** N/A

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Poland

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-05-29

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-06-19 10:55

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-06-19 11:06

**Review time:** 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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

No original findings of this manuscript