Baishideng Publishing Group

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 53710

Title: Non-invasive prediction model for predicting high-risk esophageal   varices

Reviewer's code: 03262657

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Albania

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2019-12-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-12-29 09:14

Reviewer performed review: 2020-01-04 08:10

Review time: 5 Days and 22 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Accept (General priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Minor revision	[ ] Onymous
[Y] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[Y] Major revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[Y] Advanced
			[ ] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The work entitled: "Non-invasive prediction model for predicting high-risk esophageal varices", by Long-bao Yang et al. aims to assess "predictors" of esophageal varices using various non-invasive markers based on the formula for liver and spleen volume in patients with viral cirrhosis. The manuscript is well written. Although several studies that do report a low sensitivity of non-invasive markers for the prediction of high-risk esophageal varices can be found in the literature, the strength of this study lies on the establishment of a novel model that has not been reported and it was shown to be better than other previous prediction models. Nevertheless, several points are missing in the manuscript: 1. To date, according to the recent Baveno VI criteria, the upper endoscopy is the gold standard for screening, diagnosis, and evaluation of the risk of bleeding for esophageal varices in all patients with liver cirrhosis regardless the etiologic factor, not only to viral cirrhosis. Furthermore, the upper endoscopy is more cost-effective than CT scan and MR. Also, it is a more available diagnostic tool for gastro-hepatologist than CT scan and MR. 2. The small number of cases has limited the statistical power for the validity of the prediction model. 3. The inclusion criteria for the participants are not clear: what grade of cirrhosis was necessary for inclusion? How much time before inclusion in the study the patients were diagnosed with liver cirrhosis? 4. Several confounding factors have to use in multivariate analyses such as previous treatment with beta-blockers or band ligation, antiviral treatment, patients with ongoing liver injury (e.g lack of SVR in HCV) or patients in whom the etiological factor has been removed (e.g. achievement of SVR in HCV). Also, comorbidities (obesity, diabetes, cancer, osteoporosis, pulmonary, renal and cardiovascular diseases) are frequently present in patients with compensated cirrhosis. Some of them can contribute to the decompensation of cirrhosis.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Accept (General priority)	[ ] Anonymous
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Minor revision	[Y] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[Y] Major revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[ ] Advanced
			[Y] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting paper, in which the Authors tried to define non-invasive parameters to identify patients with high risk esophageal varices. The paper is well written and the statistical analysis accurate. I have two major points : -the Authors analyzed retrospectively 86 patients. In other words their statistical analysis is a descripton of the phenomenon and it does not imply any predctive model. I suggest to apply the mathematical model prospectively to another group of patients (86) to confirm that their model, so far only descriptive of an historical phenomenon, might haver a predictive value. -I would like to suggest to define if the patients suffered from chronic or acute foms of hepatis, and eventually to include in their analysis the liver biospy if done or available. It is logical to assume that the reported ratios between the liver and spleen volumes is correlated to the structure of the liver itself. The liver structure and inevitable the liver volume will depend also by the time evolution of the viral infection

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 53710

Title: Non-invasive prediction model for predicting high-risk esophageal varices

Reviewer's code: 03670885

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Academic Research, Associate Professor, Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Mexico

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2019-12-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-12-30 01:27

Reviewer performed review: 2020-01-09 14:51

Review time: 10 Days and 13 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[Y] Accept (General priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Minor revision	[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Major revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[ ] Advanced
			[Y] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Long-bao Yang and collaborators have submitted an interesting article about "Non-invasive prediction model for predicting high-risk esophageal varices" . In my personal opinion it is a fluently written manuscript, which provides enough information about to how to detect esophageal varices and prevent future dangerous lesions. Since this model has only tested for Chinese people, I only suggest write "in Chinese population" at the end of the article title.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 53710

Title: Non-invasive prediction model for predicting high-risk esophageal   varices

Reviewer's code: 00070537

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: BSc, DSc, MD, PhD

Professional title: Chief Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Romania

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2019-12-28

Reviewer chosen by: Ruo-Yu Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-01-07 06:29

Reviewer performed review: 2020-01-12 08:46

Review time: 5 Days and 2 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[Y] Accept (General priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Minor revision	[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Major revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[ ] Advanced
			[Y] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

8

Well done research and paper. Valuable results with clinical application in viral cirrhosis. Few comments: several key words are too general ("formula; high-risk; non-invasive"). Parts of the paper show not very well English language, which has to be improved. In the Discussion chapter it may be useful for the readers an explanation on the different characteristics of viral and alcoholic cirrhosis for which this model is not applicable in alcoholic cirrhosis. Also - if any differences of importance for the diagnosis could be found between viral C and viral B hepatitis, mainly in the different way to affect right and left liver lobes volumes. It needs to add PMID and ROI to the references.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[Y] Accept (General priority)	[ ] Anonymous
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Minor revision	[Y] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Major revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[ ] Advanced
			[Y] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Interesting paper for the readers. The corrections are adequate

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No