

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 24238

Title: Exercise manual for liver disease patients

Reviewer's code: 00158730

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-01-15 13:57

Date reviewed: 2016-01-16 08:15

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	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. How did you control for worsening ascites in your patients over the course of their treatment and interventions? Did worsening ascites contribute to difficulties in respiratory efforts? Explain in detail.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 24238

Title: Exercise manual for liver disease patients

Reviewer's code: 01560464

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-01-15 13:57

Date reviewed: 2016-01-18 16:47

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [] The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> [] High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] 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"/> [Y] 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 type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1) Sarcopenia has been associated with mortality in patients with cirrhosis and contributes to an impaired quality of life in these patients. Respiratory rehabilitation in candidates for liver transplantation is poorly studied. The authors analyzed a prospective, randomized and controlled trial at the Unit of Liver Transplantation. It is meaningful study for minimizing respiratory muscle dysfunction in the postoperative period of cardiac, thoracic and abdominal surgery in patients with cirrhosis . 2) The proposed exercises were able to improve the inspiratory muscle strength and the quality of life of liver transplant waiting list patients. It is better guidance to candidates for liver transplantation during perioperation. 3) The study population was less and need to be increase in the future.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 24238

Title: Exercise manual for liver disease patients

Reviewer's code: 00053888

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-01-15 13:57

Date reviewed: 2016-01-19 00:46

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 is an interesting randomised controlled study in patients waiting for a liver transplant. The intervention group were given a series of breathing excersizes to do in an attempt to improve their respiratory function prior to transplantation. The study has suffered from a significant number of 'drop outs' in both groups from death, transplantation, etc. Despite the difficulties of a relatively poor demography and significant logistic problems because of the distances involved the authors should be congratulated in achieving a completion to the study. It appears that the intervention has significantly improved respiratory function. The manuscript needs to address a few grammatical errors and the authors should point out that the 2 groups were not ideally matched (specifically the incidence of ascites was lower in the intervention group) which might have biased the results. In addition the discussion is too long and needs shortening. In addition the title does not reflect that this is a RCT which is a great achievement and should be clear from the title. The study should now be repeated on a larger scale.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 24238

Title: Exercise manual for liver disease patients

Reviewer's code: 00005191

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-01-15 13:57

Date reviewed: 2016-01-19 20:21

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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a prospective, randomized and controlled trial conducted on chronic liver disease patients selected from the liver transplant waiting list from August 2012 to February 2014: 23 patients made up the control group, 14 patients the intervention group. Sarcopenia has been associated with mortality in patients with cirrhosis and contributes to an impaired quality of life in these patients. The difficulty that cirrhotic patients have to carry out the daily life activities, as well as their common feeling fatigue even when they are hospitalized, are complications that influence both the preoperative period and the recovery after transplantation. According to the Authors - and to previous studies - these complications can be mitigated with specific intervention programs. Specifically, the aim of this study was to increase inspiratory muscle strength and improve quality of life for liver disease patients through the use of a proposed manual of breathing exercises. This was a supervisory program performed remotely, conducted monthly by phone, in which patients were encouraged to exercise and any questions could be answered. Quality of life of patients was initially assessed through a questionnaire as well as with tests. Patients received an illustrative and explanatory manual to be followed at home daily for three months and orientation from the therapist

at the time of the delivery of the material. The general health and mental health domains received higher scores after three months in the control group ($P=0.01$) and the intervention group ($P=0.004$), but there was no significant difference between them. After the third month, both groups had an increase of maximal inspiratory pressure (MIP) and a rise in general and mental health. The root mean square (RMS) of the diaphragm was lower and the functional capacity was higher in the intervention group compared to the control one. In addition, participants in physical activity programs reported improvements in quality of life, self-esteem and well-being. According to the Authors, the proposed exercises were able to improve the inspiratory muscle strength and the quality of life of liver transplant waiting list patients. Rehabilitation becomes an important alternative in order to reduce inactivity, increase strength and muscle function, as well as aerobic capacity, and to improve functional recovery after the operation. The paper contains interesting information for the clinicians involved in the evaluation and preparation of liver transplant candidates. The main interest relies on the role of exercise protocols, but further studies, possibly based on larger samples, should be conducted. The manuscript could be published after some minor stylistic revision: in The materials and Methods part, some sentences do not read well (see paragraphs describing initial study measurements).

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 24238

Title: Exercise manual for liver disease patients

Reviewer's code: 00503243

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-01-15 13:57

Date reviewed: 2016-01-21 22:41

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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting trial on the relevance of exercise for liver disease patients on waiting list for transplantation. There are several grammatical mistakes and the text must be reviewed carefully. The intervention study is smaller with respect to the control group and this fact possibly could affect the statistics. The abstract should be rewritten, indeed: The first part of the RESULTS belong to Patients AND methods; According to the abstract the study should involve only men but this is not the case. The numbers too are wrong. In the abstract 18 vs 11, in the text and in the table 23 vs 14. Please modify and insert the right numbers in the abstract, in the text and in the table.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 24238

Title: Exercise manual for liver disease patients

Reviewer's code: 00504591

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-01-15 13:57

Date reviewed: 2016-01-25 10:24

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Limongi V et al. performed the study to examine the effect of respiratory exercise on chronic liver failure patients waiting transplantation. The study is well designed and concisely analyzed. I have some comments. 1. P6 How were patients assigned to each group? One by one consequently or did the authors use some software for random allocation? This is a very important point to be clarified. 2. P6 The authors described that the exclusion criteria consisted of the inability to understand verbal commands and acute liver failure diagnosis. Does it mean that the patients are not excluded by the poor general condition for example bed reset condition or high MELD scores? 3. P9 The authors described that there was significant difference between the first (initial) and the third month (final) MIP in the control group and in the intervention group, What was the reason for difference in the control group? 4.. P9 Please explain briefly in the text on positive data in Table 2. 5. Table 1 The authors should add the statistical difference between the two arms.