

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 35300

Title: Influence of proton pump inhibitors in the development of spontaneous bacterial peritonitis

Reviewer's code: 03474948

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2017-07-17

Date reviewed: 2017-07-22

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 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 study includes only a limited number of patients with child C (MELD >15) or advanced cirrhosis. The prevalence of SBO is higher in this population. The study should be restricted to only this patient population, and should have a adequate power to reach a reasonable conclusion.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 35300

Title: Influence of proton pump inhibitors in the development of spontaneous bacterial peritonitis

Reviewer's code: 00159305

Reviewer's country: Romania

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2017-07-17

Date reviewed: 2017-07-23

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input 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 type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

To the authors, 1. It must be a common practice for authors to number pages sequentially. 2. Throughout the text (including Abstract) there are several grammatical, syntax, and spelling errors. You should seek a copyediting service provided by professional English language editing company. 3. Several paragraphs from all sections of the manuscript are rather confusing, difficult to be followed by the readers, and should be rewritten. 4. ABSTRACT: a) Aim: last 2 lines: please, make the aim more clear. b) Method: first line "without patients with.." please, make corrections. It is difficult to understand if your study was a prospective one-while "Patients charts were reviewed to collect information..!" Please, make correction to "MELD "scored" etc. My advice is to rewrite the entire Methods text. c) Results: are confusing. -How many of 738 enrolled cirrhosis have been followed-up 60 months? -How many of PPI users and nonusers have been followed-up 60 months? 5. Core-tip: Please, rewrite the first and last sentences. 6.



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https:// www.wjgnet.com

Introduction: too long. -First paragraph: please, make it clear. -Please, delete the last 2 lines from 4th paragraph. 7. METHODS:-again , is your study prospective? -did you have a statisticians? 8. RESULTS:-please, make more clear association of SBP (SPB!) with CHILD score (3rd paragraph) and survival at 60 months. 9. DISCUSSION: please, make comments to your results; do they show any additional data compared with similar reported studies? Please, mentioned the strengths and limitations of your study. 10. CONCLUSION should be drawn more precisely , and refer to the aim of your study. The last sentence should be deleted. I regret that I cannot recommend your manuscript to be published until a major revision dealing with all the above comments is made.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 35300

Title: Influence of proton pump inhibitors in the development of spontaneous bacterial peritonitis

Reviewer's code: 00012506

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2017-07-17

Date reviewed: 2017-07-25

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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input checked="" 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 is a large observational trial enrolling 258 patients with ascites during a 9 year period. Patients with previous SBP were excluded. 151 patients used PPIs. Incidence of SBP between both groups was similar (22.5% vs. 21.5%). The only independent variable associated with development of SBP was the degree of liver dysfunction. There is lack of certain important information such as dose and type of PPI. I would like to know how many patients from the non-PPI group were started on a PPI during follow up, and vice versa. Some of the data were obtained from reviewing the chart, thus it suggests part of the data was collected retrospectively, which is important to remark thus we are aware of the potential biases. Another known risk factor for SBP development, protein concentration in ascetic fluid, has not been reported. How many patients in each group had indication for primary prophylaxis and how many were receiving it? Minor language polish is also needed.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 35300

Title: Influence of proton pump inhibitors in the development of spontaneous bacterial peritonitis

Reviewer's code: 02462322

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2017-07-17

Date reviewed: 2017-07-26

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 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input checked="" 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 study compared the incidence of SBP in patients with cirrhosis with or without PPI use. The design of the study was mentioned as a prospective study. It is an observational study where authors performed looks like a retrospective analysis of this cohort. How did you arrive at the sample size, also mention the power of the study. All high risk patients were excluded and mainly Child A and B patients were included. Also elaborate the PPI use, were the PPI use present at enrollment ?, also compare the dose, type and duration of PPI use. One patient flow diagram with patient enrolled, excluded, included, follow up and outcomes can be included. Please include the range of follow along with median follow up time. Ascitic fluid analysis with cultures in patient with SBP should be included. Please discuss the strengths and limitations of the study in one paragraph. Correct minor spelling mistakes.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 35300

Title: Influence of proton pump inhibitors in the development of spontaneous bacterial peritonitis

Reviewer's code: 03647477

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2017-07-17

Date reviewed: 2017-07-31

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 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		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have conducted a prospective study on the association of PPI and SBP. They study is well conducted and statistical methods are sound. I have the following recommendations to further enhance the manuscript. 1. The study has grammatical and spelling errors which should be corrected. 2. The authors have rightly pointed out that previous meta-analyses on this topic have been inconclusive at best. They have cited two such analysis. I would recommend to cite a meta-analysis by Khan et al. This is the only analysis which used the GRADE framework and results are consistent with what authors found in this study. 3. Previously only two prospective studies exist on this topic and both did not show any association. It is important to realize that associations found with retrospective studies are more consistent with confounding rather than true associations. Therefore, the authors should describe these prospective studies and meta-analysis by Khan et al in greater detail in the discussion section to support their



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https:// www.wjgnet.com

own results. 4. How can we be sure that non-users were not taking over the counter PPI?

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 35300

Title: Influence of proton pump inhibitors in the development of spontaneous bacterial peritonitis

Reviewer's code: 02861225

Reviewer's country: Austria

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2017-07-17

Date reviewed: 2017-08-01

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> 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 checked="" 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 is a well performed study. I have some comments to the authors: Major: - In the Abstract-methods, Methods section and Discussion section it is stated that this is a prospective cohort study. Yet in the Informed Consent Statement file it is written that „This is a retrospective cohort chart review“. Hence please clarify by showing the original ethics approval of your institution what type of study this is and if the primary outcome parameter was already defined by March 2005. - Did you perform a power calculation based on previous literature; since "PPI/SBP" is a debated topic and the observable differences might need big cohorts? - „For patients with SBP, survival at 60 months was 55.1%, vs. 61.7% in patients without SBP (p=0.34).“ - this is in contrast to previous literature. Please discuss appropriately. Minor: - Statistical analysis: „p=0.05“ - the letter p is not shown properly in the word file. - Did PMN count or serum sodium also emerged as risk factors for SBP development as shown in Liver Int. 2015



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https:// www.wjgnet.com

35(9):2121-8. or Korean J Intern Med. 2009 Jun;24(2):106-12. - How many patients in the group of no PPI user had peptic ulcer, GERD or dyspepsia? - What were the numbers of patients taking other reflux-therapeutics in both groups (e.g. H2 blocker; antacida)?