

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 31479

Title: Developing a donation after cardiac death risk index for adult and pediatric liver transplantation

Reviewer's code: 00504591

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-11-23 14:25

Date reviewed: 2016-11-23 22:14

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

Khorsandi et analyzed their DCD patients data and drew the risk index for graft outcome after liver transplantation. I have some comments. 1. Can you cite the reference describing risk index after liver transplantation using DCD grafts? If yes, please cite them and make a discussion. If no, emphasize the new points of the present analysis in the discussion section. 2. (P7, the second paragraph) Please show the indication of the biopsy of the donor. Some donors are rejected only on the macroscopic observation? 3. (P8, the second paragraph) Is $p=0.3$ correct? 4. (Table 3) What are 3/12, 6/12, 12/12, 60/12? Please explain.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 31479

Title: Developing a donation after cardiac death risk index for adult and pediatric liver transplantation

Reviewer's code: 00504665

Reviewer's country: Singapore

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-11-23 14:25

Date reviewed: 2016-11-29 11:27

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|--|--|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | <input checked="" 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 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

it is a well written manuscript reviewing the use of liver donation after cardiac death, and predicting graft survival in low, standard and high risk groups. It would be of great interest to the readers of this journal. perhaps, the surgical details in the manuscript can be shortened as there is nothing unusual about the surgical procedures.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 31479

Title: Developing a donation after cardiac death risk index for adult and pediatric liver transplantation

Reviewer's code: 00054255

Reviewer's country: South Korea

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-11-23 14:25

Date reviewed: 2016-12-05 10:44

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|--|--|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | <input checked="" 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 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 manuscript regarding safety of liver transplant recipient according to the cardiac death risk index that authors developed according to the factors obtained from both cardiac death donor and recipient on the basis of pretty good number(n=261) of LT with DCD donor database that they had already undergone. The message is precise, balanced and very informative guidance for the successful liver transplantation using cardiac death donors. One of reviewer concerns or interest is that initially how authors grouped each disease to low, standard and high DCD risk groups in the Table 1 and figure 1.