



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: editorialoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8862

Title: A D-MELD Risk Cap Combined with Rule 14 Decreases Waitlist and Post Transplant Mortality using Markov Microsimulation

Reviewer code: 00028366

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-01-09 22:03

Date reviewed: 2014-01-26 04:42

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)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper has no structure and difficult to follow. The authors need to adjust their manuscript according the instruction for authors and re submit



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: editorialoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8862

Title: A D-MELD Risk Cap Combined with Rule 14 Decreases Waitlist and Post Transplant Mortality using Markov Microsimulation

Reviewer code: 02462197

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-01-09 22:03

Date reviewed: 2014-02-25 02:48

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 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 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"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

February 24, 2014 World Journal of Transplantation ESPS Manuscript NO: 8862 Title: A D-MELD Risk Cap Combined with Rule 14 Decreases Waitlist and Post Transplant Mortality using Markov Microsimulation This is multicentre study based on the UNOS database aimed to evaluate if the selection of an appropriate D-MELD risk cap \pm Rule 14 could improve post-liver transplant and overall survival of listed patients.

GENERAL COMMENTS (1) Importance of the research: the present study is really interesting, trying to define with the construction of a rigorous mathematical model if it is possible to better refine allocation policy, thus minimizing the risk of futile transplants; (2) Novelty of the research: the study is based on an innovative combination of two previously described parameters, namely D-MELD and the MELD cut-off of 14. The study is innovative; (3) Presentation and readability of the manuscript: the paper is very well written; (4) Ethics of the research: no ethical conflicts exist in the present study.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS (1) Title: the title appears to be appropriated; (2) Abstract: it clearly reports the objectives of the study; (3) Introduction: well written and clear; (4) Methods: clear explication of the statistical models adopted; (5) Results: the most interesting part of the paper; (6) Discussion: valuable conclusions are provided in this section; (7) References: the references are relevant and updated.