



SURGERY

*University of Oklahoma
College of Medicine
800 Stanton L. Young Blvd
Oklahoma City, OK 73104*

October 31, 2023

RE: Submission of research article entitled: “**The Impact of Sex on the Outcomes of Deceased Donor Liver Transplantation**”

Dear Jin-Lei Wang and Associate Editors of the *World Journal of Transplantation*,

We would like to thank you for taking the time and effort to provide valuable feedback regarding our manuscript.

Below, please find a detailed response to each reviewer. We have addressed all of your comments and concerns, making the appropriate changes to the manuscript. All changes have been reviewed and approved by all authors.

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The authors the Impact of gender on the outcomes of deceased donor liver transplantation. The comparisons were not restricted to long-term outcomes, but indications, graft characteristics and postoperative complications also. This is a large cohort from a huge database. The results section are figures and didactic. The discussion section is updated and concise. The conclusions can impact mainly in claryfing clinicians that postoperative management and follow up of LT patients should be in a individual basis, considering gender variables. English polite is needed.

Thank you very much for the comments. To address your concern of emphasizing postoperative management and follow up of liver transplant patients within our conclusions, we have added a discussion of this within the Conclusions section on page 9, lines 29-31:

“Thus, management and follow up of liver transplant patients should be individualized, with consideration of sex-specific variables. This may further optimize long-term outcomes, and further prospective studies are warranted.”

Further, per your concern for the language quality, we have had the manuscript reviewed by two native English speakers and have revised it appropriately. Below is a detailed outline of all the changes that were made in order to ensure high English quality.

1. Page 3, lines 3-5: The following was added to provide a more detailed description of our use of the University of Essen’s transplant database: “was

- performed with collection of baseline patient characteristics, transplant-related data, and short-term outcomes. Comparisons of these data were made with”
2. Page 3, line 13: the full term “hepatocellular carcinoma” was added per guidelines for the Abstract section
 3. Page 4, lines 23-24: “more individualized strategies on sex-based differences in transplantation are” was changed to “more research into sex-related differences in transplant patients is”
 4. Page 4, line 28: “assess if there is any association” was changed to “assess association.”
 5. Page 5, lines 2-3: The following was added to further clarify the process through which the data was gathered: “which included pre-collected and deidentified data”
 6. Page 5, lines 16-17: The following was added: “Finally, overall survival was also recorded to a limit of 140 months post-operatively.”
 7. Page 5, line 19: “Non-normal data categories” was changed to “Non-normally distributed data”
 8. Page 5, line 20: “form” was changed to “draw”
 9. Page 5, line 30: “given” was changed to “derived”
 10. Page 6, line 9: “on average” was added
 11. Page 6, line 11: “less” was changed to “fewer”
 12. Page 6, line 12: “more” was changed to “higher incidences of”
 13. Page 6, line 12: “alcohol related” was changed to “alcohol-related”
 14. Page 6, line 13: comma added after “donors”
 15. Page 6, line 18: “analyses” changed to “analysis”
 16. Page 6, line 19: “differences in” was added
 17. Page 6, line 21: “differences in” was added
 18. Page 6, line 22: “grade” was added
 19. Page 6, line 22: “differences in” was added
 20. Page 6, line 25: “based on sex and an age cut-off of 50 years old” was changed to “according to sex and age-related categorization”
 21. Page 6, line 30: “sex ratios” was changed to “what is generally”
 22. Page 6, line 30: “sex” was deleted
 23. Page 6, line 31: “according to sex” was added
 24. Page 7, line 2: “which is in line with literature” was changed to “which is in accordance with existing literature”
 25. Page 7, line 4: “We did not have data for the underlying etiology for ALF in our cohort. In addition,” was deleted
 26. Page 7, line 6: “alcohol related” was changed to “alcohol-related”
 27. Page 7, lines 8-9: The following was added: “Unfortunately, we did not have data for the underlying etiology of ALF in our cohort. As a result, further information would be required to make solid conclusions.”
 28. Page 7, line 11: “on average” was added
 29. Page 7, line 14: “a” was deleted
 30. Page 7, line 14: “rate” was changed to “rates”
 31. Page 7, line 15: “that” was added
 32. Page 7, line 18: “tailored” was deleted
 33. Page 7, line 19: “managed, where possible,” was added
 34. Page 7, line 19: “specific” was added
 35. Page 7, line 20: “taking sex into account” was changed to “which considers sex”
 36. Page 7, lines 26-27: parentheses were added around the following phrase: “female patients typically demonstrate a lower GFR per given creatinine level”
 37. Page 7, line 27: “Despite the disadvantages of the MELD score system due to biological factors” was deleted
 38. Page 7, line 27: “actually” was deleted
 39. Page 7, line 28: “not” was added
 40. Page 7, line 28: “borderline” was deleted
 41. Page 7, line 29: “takes” was changed to “requires a”
 42. Page 7, lines 29-30: “for female patients as compared to male patients” was changed to “in female patients as male patients”

43. Page 8, line 7: comma was added after “outcomes”
44. Page 8, line 9: “However,” was added
45. Page 8, line 18: “In this study,” was added
46. Page 8, line 20: “as compared to all other groups” was added
47. Page 8, line 21: “already existing disease etiology and donor differences” was changed to “existing donor differences”
48. Page 8, line 21: “we cannot make firm conclusions. However,” was deleted
49. Page 8, line 22: “the” was added
50. Page 8, line 32: “some” was changed to “other”
51. Page 9, line 4: “however, it was not in our study” was changed to “however, this was not seen in our study”
52. Page 9, line 4: “the” was added
53. Page 9, line 5: “the” was deleted
54. Page 9, line 7: “donor mechanism” was changed to “other factors”
55. Page 9, line 28: “in the allocation” was changed to “to the allocation process”
56. Page 9, lines 29-30: The following sentence was added: “Thus, management and follow up of liver transplant patients should be individualized, with consideration of sex-specific variables.”
57. Page 9, line 31: “might” was changed to “may”
58. Page 10, line 2: “the” was added
59. Page 10, line 2: “Meeting” was added
60. Page 10, line 3: “May 3” and “as e-poster ID # eP-167” was deleted
61. Page 10, line 3: “San Diego California” was deleted

Editorial office’s comments:

(1) Science editor:

The manuscript has been peer-reviewed, and it is ready for the first decision.

(2) Company editor-in-chief:

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Transplantation, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office’s comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Before its final acceptance, please provide and upload the following important documents: Institutional Review Board Approval Form or Document, the primary version (PDF) of the Institutional Review Board’s official approval, prepared in the official language of the authors’ country; Signed Informed Consent Form(s) or Document(s), the primary version (PDF) of the Informed Consent Form that has been signed by all subjects and investigators of the study, prepared in the official language of the authors’ country. Before final acceptance, uniform presentation should be used for figures showing the same or similar contents; for example, “Figure 1 Pathological changes of atrophic gastritis after treatment. A: ...; B: ...; C: ...; D: ...; E: ...; F: ...; G: ...”. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor. In order to respect and protect the author’s intellectual property rights and prevent others from misappropriating figures without the author's authorization or abusing figures without indicating the source, we will indicate the author's copyright for figures originally generated by the author, and if the author has used a figure published elsewhere or that is copyrighted, the author needs to be authorized by the previous publisher or the copyright holder and/or indicate the reference source and copyrights. Please check and confirm whether the figures are original (i.e. generated de novo by the author(s) for this paper). If the picture is ‘original’, the author needs to add the following copyright information to the bottom right-hand side of the picture in PowerPoint (PPT):

Copyright ©The Author(s) 2023. Authors are required to provide standard three-line tables, that is, only the top line, bottom line, and column line are displayed, while other table lines are hidden. The contents of each cell in the table should conform to the editing specifications, and the lines of each row or column of the table should be aligned. Do not use carriage returns or spaces to replace lines or vertical lines and do not segment cell content.

Thank you very much for your review. For this retrospective review study, we utilized the University of Essen transplant database, which included pre-collected and de-identified patient information. As such, this study was deemed exempt from Institutional Review Board approval by the University of Essen. To further clarify this within our manuscript, we have added an explanation within the Methods section on page 6, lines 3-6:

“Study Approval and Ethical Conduct

This study was deemed exempt by the Institutional Review Board of Essen University. All research referenced in this manuscript was conducted in accordance with institutional processes as well as both the Declarations of Helsinki and Istanbul.”

With regard to the formatting issues, we can confirm that both of the figures included in the manuscript are original in nature and were generated by the authors using the data included in this study. We are unable to convert these figures to a format different from their current setting within the manuscript. However, we are able to provide a PowerPoint file with movable items for your use. We have also made sure to include a copyright statement at the right-bottom corner as instructed. Additionally, the tables have been converted to a standard three-line format and have been adjusted per your guidelines.

We thank the editors for their review of our manuscript and hope you will continue to consider our work for publication. If there are any questions related to this work, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,
Nicole Mountz