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COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a Novel work that study new novel molecules of association with chronic liver disease and its consequences. The research paper needs major changes to be more acceptable from the editorial point of view and to be easier for reading by avoiding lengthy discussion and deliver a direct message.
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COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Interesting and certainly new topic, but several very important criticisms may be raised as detailed below. 1-Abstract needs an introduction not only “aims”. Methods are necessary for a scientific paper. 2-Introduction should be sensibly shortened and focused on the topic. The same for discussion. At this respect I recommend to pay attention to results. The manuscript is a scientific report not a review! 3-Was the series of patients consecutive or not? Is there any selection bias? Were all patients included systematically screened for portal vein thrombosis? All these aspects are important to avoid selection bias. 4-Since authors try to associate omentin and vaspin levels to presence or not of portal vein thrombosis (PVT) they should introduce in the reference list also recent works on the topic such as Kolombakis J Hepatol 2016 (role of FactorVIII/Protein C ratio on the risk of de novo PVT), La Mura V et al. Liver Intern 2016 (role of thrombomodulin resistance on the risk of de novo PVT). 5-In my opinion there is a conceptual mistake: authors conduct a cross-sectional analysis of their data. Therefore, the relation between PVT and the levels of omentin is a simple association and not a cause effect relation. Otherwise, they should have presented a follow-up study demonstrating that those
patients with low omentin levels were those at higher risk of developing PVT in the follow-up. This is a limitation worth of a comment in the discussion. 6-hemostatic tests should be better described in order to allow a reader not used to work with them to understand the meaning of these tests. 7-Acronims abbreviation in the main text as well as in the tables should be explained. 8-Why authors choose MLED cut off of 18 and HOMA-IR of 3? Was it the median value, was used any objective approach to choose them (Youden index? ROC curve? Tertiles of the variable?) 9-English should be revised