

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Hepatology

**Manuscript NO:** 49339

**Title:** Impact on 30-day readmissions for cirrhotic patients with ascites after an educational intervention: a pilot study

**Reviewer's code:** 02731847

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, MSc

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Staff Physician

**Reviewer's country:** Brazil

**Author's country:** United States

**Reviewer chosen by:** Li-Jun Cui (Quit in 2019)

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-06-23 18:05

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-06-24 23:51

**Review time:** 1 Day and 5 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The subject of this paper is rather interesting and it is one I am quite passionate about, since I educate many students and fellows on cirrhosis and its complications. The study is well designed. I have some concerns though: 1. Abstract – it is poorly organized and very disruptive. I suggest making it into an actual text and summarizing it further – it is too long and has some data that should not be in an abstract. 2. Language – it needs some language improvement. Some phrases just do not make sense as they are written. 3. Background – It gives a nice insight into the matter at hand. Although, it needs some language refinement. It lacks an actual definition of the objective of this study. 4. Methods – This is better written than the background session. If Minnesota center has a high-volume liver transplantation, I wonder why are cirrhotic patients being treated by hospitalists and not by hepatologists from the LT group? Could you elaborate this further? 5. Results – It is well written, tables are very informative. The writing in length of stay is not very clear – please revise it. You need to explain initials in the tables. 6. Discussion – it is overall well written. I recommend acceptance after revision.

## INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

### *Google Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☒ No

### *BPG Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**<https://www.wjgnet.com>**

[ Y ] No

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Hepatology

**Manuscript NO:** 49339

**Title:** Impact on 30-day readmissions for cirrhotic patients with ascites after an educational intervention: a pilot study

**Reviewer's code:** 02541391

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, MSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's country:** Romania

**Author's country:** United States

**Reviewer chosen by:** Li-Jun Cui (Quit in 2019)

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-06-18 09:11

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-06-29 08:23

**Review time:** 10 Days and 23 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

This is a well-written paper on a rather novel subject, on which not much literature exists at the moment. It will be of interest to a wide audience and may appeal to different specialties and even policy makers. The one concern would be the need for a thorough revision for brevity, clarity and style.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No