

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27374

Title: Is MELD score failing patients with liver disease and hepatorenal syndrome?

Reviewer's code: 00068723

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-05-26 18:37

Date reviewed: 2016-05-26 20:27

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" 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

This manuscript discusses post-transplantation survival. The idea was interesting that renal failure was one major factor regarding survival after liver transplantation. The concept was rationale because normal renal function is essential for healthy. Renal failure consists one of the organ failure of multiple organ failure. References were limited number, which was acceptable because the manuscript was "to the Editor".

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27374

Title: Is MELD score failing patients with liver disease and hepatorenal syndrome?

Reviewer's code: 00181388

Reviewer's country: Iran

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-05-26 18:37

Date reviewed: 2016-05-26 21:26

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" 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

1. Some sentences has been repeated multiple times like sentences about serum creatinine, MELD score, ... which can be deleted. 2. The text can be shorter by mixing some concepts. 3. Some sentences have no references while they need.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27374

Title: Is MELD score failing patients with liver disease and hepatorenal syndrome?

Reviewer's code: 02445121

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-05-26 18:37

Date reviewed: 2016-05-30 11:09

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"/> 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

In this letter, the authors discussed that application of MELD score in the patients with liver disease and hepatorenal syndrome and suggested to reassess the application of MELD and the impact of renal insufficiency. This suggestion is reasonable and considerable.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27374

Title: Is MELD score failing patients with liver disease and hepatorenal syndrome?

Reviewer's code: 02445541

Reviewer's country: Netherlands

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-05-26 18:37

Date reviewed: 2016-05-30 17:50

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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

This manuscript ends with the statement; "While MELD score is the gold standard for predicting wait list mortality, a notable weakness for liver allocation lies in predicting post transplantation survival, particularly with renal insufficiency", and "to reassess the application of MELD and the impact of renal insufficiency". I fully agree that such a conversation is useful, but I miss considerations of others and the many references which already discuss the relative sensitivity and specificity of MELD as prognostic parameter. I give some examples but there are far more in literature. Gennaro D" Amico et al. J of Hepatol 2006;44:217-231 who conclude that clinical practice strengthens the current use of CPS in cirrhotic patients at large and MELD in decompensated cirrhotic patients. Theodoridou et al . The Royal Free Hospital score (RFH): a calibrated prognostic model for patients with cirrhosis admitted to Intensive care unit. Am J GE 2014; CLIF-SOFA did not perform better than RFH. Wan et al. Combining serum cystatin c with total bilirubin improves short term mortality prediction in patients with HBV related acute-on-chronic liver failure. PlosOne 2015;10(1)e 0116968. Emerson P et al. The utility of scoring systems in critically ill cirrhotic patients admitted to a general intensive care unit. J of critical care 2014; 29(6)1131, who suggest that serum



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

arterial lactate may improve the prognostic ability. Oberkofler CE et al. MELD score greater than 23 predicts length of stay in the ICU but not mortality in liver transplant recipients. Critical Care 2010;14:R117

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27374

Title: Is MELD score failing patients with liver disease and hepatorenal syndrome?

Reviewer's code: 02860590

Reviewer's country: Brazil

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-05-26 18:37

Date reviewed: 2016-06-13 05:47

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input checked="" 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"/> 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

Specific comments: The subject is relevant; however it is not a new topic in the literature. Several researchers have been analysing the limitation of the MELD score. On the other hand, it is important to recognize renal injury early before the damage is done. The manuscript should be described in a more concise and substantial manner. There is limited information regarding a theoretical framework that grounds the research. Please get a native English speaker to check the English used in the paper. Grammatical errors/constructions should be evaluated along the whole article. ? Reviewer conclusion: Accept but needs minor and major revision

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27374

Title: Is MELD score failing patients with liver disease and hepatorenal syndrome?

Reviewer's code: 00028366

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-05-26 18:37

Date reviewed: 2016-06-13 20:16

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" 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 impact of renal insufficiency has been emphasised as an important part of assessment in association with MELD score and it is a relevant discussion. I support the authors suggestion