

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27410

Title: Therapeutic alternatives for the treatment of type 1 hepatorenal syndrome: A Delphi technique-based consensus

Reviewer's code: 00537851

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-05-30 09:38

Date reviewed: 2016-05-30 13:57

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[Y] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[] Grade B: Very good	[] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[] The same title	[] High priority for publication
[] Grade C: Good	[] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[] Duplicate publication	[] Rejection
[] Grade D: Fair	[] Grade D: Rejected	[Y] No	[] Minor revision
[] Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	[] Major revision
		[] The same title	
		[] Duplicate publication	
		[] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a well written interesting well balanced and important review on a severe disease such as hepato-renal syndrome.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27410

Title: Therapeutic alternatives for the treatment of type 1 hepatorenal syndrome: A Delphi technique-based consensus

Reviewer's code: 03262854

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-05-30 09:38

Date reviewed: 2016-06-03 19:34

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article entitled "Therapeutic alternatives for the treatment of type 1 hepatorenal syndrome: A Delphi technique -based consensus" is a very informative article about hepatorena? syndrome. It is well written and I think it will guide the clinicians. However I want to point just one clerical error: The fourth sentence of introduction section is "Table 1 depicts the diagnostic criteria proposed by the Ascites Club for the diagnosis of HSR". Abbreviation HSR should be spelled correctly.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27410

Title: Therapeutic alternatives for the treatment of type 1 hepatorenal syndrome: A Delphi technique-based consensus

Reviewer's code: 00005658

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-05-30 09:38

Date reviewed: 2016-06-05 10:41

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The study is well organized and properly processed. The conclusion is reasonable.