

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 79547

Title: CLIF-SOFA and CLIF-C scores for the prognostication of Acute-on-Chronic Liver

Failure and Acute Decompensation of Cirrhosis: Systematic Review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05424290 **Position:** Editorial Board

Academic degree: MBBS, MD

Professional title: Academic Research, Doctor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Manuscript submission date: 2022-08-26

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-05 16:55

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-14 08:50

Review time: 8 Days and 15 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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



Baishideng **Publishing**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-399-1568 E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous

statements Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Extensive data and research has been done in hepatology for evaluation of different prognostic scores. The CANONIC study brought a paradigm shift in understanding ACLF. Authors have reviewed the literature thoroughly and found that CLIF-SOFA score has been found to be best for prognostication of patients with ACLF.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 79547

Title: CLIF-SOFA and CLIF-C scores for the prognostication of Acute-on-Chronic Liver

Failure and Acute Decompensation of Cirrhosis: Systematic Review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06391996 Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: Doctor, PhD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Manuscript submission date: 2022-08-26

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-01 02:39

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-02 10:06

Review time: 1 Day and 7 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) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous

statements Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The title partly reflects the main subject of the manuscript. The abstract and key words summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript. The background describes the significance of the study. The methodology is scientific. The conclusion has certain guiding significance for clinical practice. The discussion part is sufficient, but the results and conclusions of this study are not discussed in depth. The illustrations and tables reflect the content of the articles, while the table which showed 50 included articles lacks title and note. The references cite recent literature, but the format should be unified. The language grammar is accurate and appropriate. This article is a systematic review, and the PRISMA 2009 listing has been provided. The manuscript discusses in various scoring systems in ACLF prognosis assessment, draw a CLIF-SOFA score in predicting the short-term prognosis of patients with ACLF is superior to other models. CLIF-SOFA and CLIF-C scores could accurately predict the short-term and long-term mortality of patients with ACLF, which might guide the selection and application of prognostic evaluation model for patients with ACLF. This study has some limitations: The title of study is "CLIF-SOFA and CLIF-C scores for the prognostication of Acute-on-Chronic Liver Failure", while many research object is not patients with ACLF. The CLIF-C AD score shouldn't be used for prognostication evaluation of patients with ACLF. The article does not clearly distinguish AD from ACLF. "These results indicate that liver failure is not necessary for the diagnosis of ACLF when distinguishing ACLF" is mentioned in "Core tip", while the basis is not found throughout the paper, please explain in detail. For the specific modification requirements to the author, please see the attachment.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 79547

Title: CLIF-SOFA and CLIF-C scores for the prognostication of Acute-on-Chronic Liver

Failure and Acute Decompensation of Cirrhosis: Systematic Review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00186136 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Manuscript submission date: 2022-08-26

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-04 14:38

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-04 17:05

Review time: 2 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
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) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



Baishideng **Publishing**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous

statements Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

ABSTRACT: CLIF-SOFA does not distinguish AD from ACLF. It does detect de presence of ACLF in patients with or without AD, and classifies the ACLF into three grades. Core tip: Conclusion is different from abstract conclusion, and from the article conclusion. ACLF includes liver failure in its nomenclature. Discussion: The objectives of the study should be on the end of introduction, before Methods. Conclusion: The aim of the study should match the conclusion. The first table is very interesting, though it thus not have a number or a title. Tables 1 and 2 are not necessary and should be removed. The study is on CLIF-SOFA



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 79547

Title: CLIF-SOFA and CLIF-C scores for the prognostication of Acute-on-Chronic Liver

Failure and Acute Decompensation of Cirrhosis: Systematic Review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00186136 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Manuscript submission date: 2022-08-26

Reviewer chosen by: Ji-Hong Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-20 14:39

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-20 16:24

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
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) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous



https://www.wjgnet.com

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Corrections have been made and the final article has been improved. Unfortunately, the aim of the study is in the middle of the introduction, as it should be at the end of the introduction, before methods. I still believe that tables explaining child and meld in a specialist journal are unnecessary.