

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 11818

Title: Predictability of IL-28B-polymorphism on protease-inhibitor-based triple-therapy in chronic HCV-genotype-1 patients: a meta-analysis

Reviewer code: 02823981

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-06-08 17:49

Date reviewed: 2014-06-10 22:34

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The scope of the reference maybe not enough. The theme is meaningful. Due to the limitation of the studies, a lack of adequate evidence to support the conclusion.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 11818

Title: Predictability of IL-28B-polymorphism on protease-inhibitor-based triple-therapy in chronic HCV-genotype-1 patients: a meta-analysis

Reviewer code: 02458152

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-06-08 17:49

Date reviewed: 2014-06-23 21:24

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript presents a meta-analysis of Predictability of IL-28B-polymorphism on protease-inhibitor-based triple-therapy in chronic HCV-genotype-1 patients. The quantitative analysis appears to have been conducted carefully and appropriately, and the results should be of substantial interest to this journal's readers. However, the manuscript omits several "best practices" that should be part of any meta-analysis. The manuscript contains multiple instances of inconsistent reporting of estimates. That is 'odds' and 'odds ratio' across the text and in the abstract. Grammatical errors are found throughout the manuscript. I recommend that the authors pay careful attention to English grammar and sentence construction in the revision of the manuscript. Detail comments Abstract 1. The authors stated in the abstract that they searched PubMed, but in page#7, line#1 they did mention of Medline. Although PubMed and Medline do overlap the 2 databases are not in anyway the same. They should clarify the databases they searched. 2. In the result section and elsewhere in the text, the authors made reference to 'odds' and odds ratio. Please, state which effect you used. If they mean odds ratio which I am sure is the case, they should state that. 3. Please delete the expression ' however it indicates a beneficial effect' in para#3, line#8-9 of the abstract Methods 1. Pg#7, para#1, line#1: Instead of we have searchedthe authors should write we searched..... 2. pg#7, para#1, line 2: please delete abstract and full length. What does full length mean here? if it's full text of the article please state that. I am not sure if the authors used

results from abstracts. If that is the case, please state why you decide to use abstracts instead of full text. 3. It is a bit confusing how the authors describe the search strategy. Please, clarify your search strategy. As it stands it is messy (please see The Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology consensus statement (MOOSE): Stroup DF et al. JAMA. 2000;283:2008-12). The authors should also provide an appendix describing in detail the search strategy. 4. The criteria used to screen the studies were not clearly stated. Pls re-phrase you criteria (see the BMJ reference above). 5. I am wondering if the authors also search the reference lists of relevant articles. If they did they should state that. Else, they should state why they didn't. 6. Throughout the manuscripts the authors have been using reference and sometimes studies. I recommend they stick to 'studies' instead of 'reference.' 7. In the inclusion criteria, the authors stated ' no English reference'. It's not clear to me what they mean. 8. Revise the sentence '2 authors independently made the data extraction' on pge#7,para#3, line#1 9. pg#7, para#3, line#2-3: Move 'the statistical analysis was performed by CR (It wasn't necessary to state the person who did the analysis here) to the next paragraph. 10. Figure 1 is messy. It is poorly presented. It doesn't match with the eligibility criteria in the text. I strongly recommend modification of this figure to conform to standard practice. Results 1. The entire sentence from para#1, line#1-7 is inaccurate. Please modify figure and revise the sentence accordingly. 2. line#6 should read.....This meta-analysis was based on 10 studies. 'Not based on the remaining references'. 3. Table I: I am not sure why the authors decided to number the references in the tables. Again I was expecting to see more information about eligible studies in Table I: The information in the Table and in the text is scanty. The authors should consider revising the table. 4. The column containing relevant papers should be labelled reference. 5. The sentence beginning with.... Regarding SMP and FLP our search should be revised (para#1, line#14-15) 6. para#2: I am not sure if the point estimates reported by the authors were odds or odds ratio. I suspect the latter. The authors have used i

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 11818

Title: Predictability of IL-28B-polymorphism on protease-inhibitor-based triple-therapy in chronic HCV-genotype-1 patients: a meta-analysis

Reviewer code: 02861134

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-06-08 17:49

Date reviewed: 2014-07-05 00:39

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Author Guidelines has been followed properly in preparing the manuscript . Literature review is adequate. The references are appropriate and relevant. Tables and figures reflect the major findings of the study, and they are appropriately presented. Language evaluation - Grade A: priority publishing. The paper is well organized. In my opinion, the paper is publishable with no significant revision.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 11818

Title: Predictability of IL-28B-polymorphism on protease-inhibitor-based triple-therapy in chronic HCV-genotype-1 patients: a meta-analysis

Reviewer code: 02860745

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-06-08 17:49

Date reviewed: 2014-07-09 22:24

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Congratulations! Great topic, I liked the introduction and the direction of the discussion, it analyses an aspect that needs to be discussed! It needs some language polishing, since some of the phrases are misconstrued. Some data are not clear, such as databases used (was MEDLINE included or not? It is not in your figure number 1) When you performe logistic regression, usually it informs ODDS RATIO (the whole paper mentions odds, is that correct or do you mean odds ratio?) Figures 2 and 3 perhaps should change the information axis, and add a marker for number 1, since in odds ratio charts it indicates if there is benefit or harm. All in all, I think some revision is needed!