

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 9435

Title: Reuse of liver grafts following the brain death of the initial recipient

Reviewer code: 02549484

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2014-02-13 10:26

Date reviewed: 2014-02-24 00:36

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. The donor or the initial recipient, who has the right to use the liver grafts? 2. Some liver disease may cause brain edema, whether this case has been taken consideration? 3. In the graph, the liver disease and cause of death of some donors is N/A, the youngest one is 4, so why do they want to be a donor? Whether because of the N/A has some influence on the conclusion?

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 9435

Title: Reuse of liver grafts following the brain death of the initial recipient

Reviewer code: 02860775

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2014-02-13 10:26

Date reviewed: 2014-02-26 20:40

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this manuscript, TANAKA et al. investigate whether the re-use liver retransplantation can be considered a reasonable clinical opportunity in marginal cases. Starting from a case report, the authors undertake a systematic survey of the literature. Although experience is still limited, the authors conclude that in this setting, outcomes of liver transplantation (patient/graft survival) are similar to those reported with conventional donors. The authors face with a still unsolved, very interesting transplant issue, which is of potential great impact due to the shortness of donors, but that so far, it has been reported in literature only sporadically. Although the manuscript is basically well written, a number of specific, major concerns are worth being addressed: 4. It is unclear to the reviewer how search of literature has been performed; in particular, the key words and the criteria of paper selection need to be clearly stated in the method section. 5. A critical point is the marginal recipient that theoretically may take advantage of reuse of liver grafts. This is an important issue, which is mostly missing in the Table provided by the authors. A careful discussion on the potential indications by reviewing data from literature whenever available is strongly claimed. 6. In case description, authors state: "Even though his HCC appeared to be stable ... long-term survival without liver replacement was considered unlikely. The opportunity was discussed with the patient and his family ...". This is a fundamental aspect with tremendous ethical implications. Unfortunately, no approval by the local Ethical Committee is mentioned by the authors in their case description. Furthermore, given its relevance this issue should be also properly outlined and commented in the discussion.