



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	2014_AIR_10443
Title of the Manuscript:	Validation of decision cut off values of serum albumin and prothrombin time for differentiating between compensated and decompensated liver cirrhosis.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Abstract The first and second lines of the result section lacks a little bit of consistency. 6.79/2.19 vs 0.86/0.02, $p < 0.001$ should have been 6.79 +/- 2.19 vs 0.86 +/- 0.02. More so, according to SDI paper template, significant (<i>P</i>-italicized) values should be expressed as $P < .001$</p> <p>Introduction Line 38 'pt' should be capitalized (PT).</p> <p>Statistical analysis What type of analyses was carried out? State how the results were expressed.</p> <p>Results The appropriate way of expressing significant values should be adhered to (i.e. $P < .001$ or $P < .05$). Express the type of analysis that generated the data on each of the table as a footnote.</p> <p>Discussion Lines 163-164 "as definitive histopathological tissue examinations are not always possible in these cases". Why? This part should be re-written to avoid future complications. I suggest "as histopathological</p>	<p>Corrected according to the reviewer's suggestions.</p> <p>Corrected as suggested.</p> <p>Corrected as suggested (line nos. 100-106 in the revised article).</p> <p>Corrected as suggested (line nos. 114 and 126).</p> <p>Revised as suggested (line nos. 192-93).</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>examinations are more invasive and complications have been reported to arise following biopsy.</p> <p>Line 197 “these study studied parameters”.</p> <p>Lines 197-199 In our study, such critical values of serum albumin and PT between the compensated and decompensated group of liver cirrhosis has been were found to be 2.97 g/dl and 19.47 seconds respectively (Fig. 1 & 2).</p> <p>Lines 205-207 “serum albumin was not only significantly decreased in decompensatedbut more importantly, to a lesser level than observed in other studies” Why is this so? What was the sample sizes used in other/previous considered studies?</p> <p>Duplication (lines 31-33 & 219 -220 and 33-35 & 221) “Oral supplementation with branched chain amino acid (BCAA) preparations have been reported to improve event free survival and quality of life by raising serum albumin concentrations in patients with decompensated cirrhosis[10].” “These findings were strengthened by some observations that suggested a reduction in ascitis in hepatic cirrhosis after BCAA supplementation [11].” “BCAA also reduced ascitis in decompensated liver cirrhosis [11].” The above sentence have been duplicated, one of which must be removed.</p> <p>I suggest that lines 218-229 and 235-242 be moved to</p>	<p>Corrected as suggested (line no. 226)</p> <p>Corrected as suggested (line no. 227).</p> <p>Probable explanations have been provided in the line numbers 236-37 and 241-42.</p> <p>As suggested the duplications have been removed</p>
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>the introductory aspect of this manuscript. They made the discussion too long.</p> <p>I also suggest that lines 205-207 and 229-233 be appropriately merged in a single paragraph.</p>	<p>As suggested the lines have been modified (line nos. 234-43). As the similar notions have been already provided in the Introduction part (line nos. 28-32), so as suggested these lines have been merged into same paragraph.</p>
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>Remark This is an interesting and overall well written manuscript. It strikes the need for cut off values for diagnosing decompensation process of liver cirrhosis which is altogether less invasive. Author(s) should note that results generated in this study should be reported in past tense.</p> <p>Font size Font sizes used in the manuscript should not be stated as seen in the manuscript (lines 13 and 60-61).</p> <p>Expression of P values Author(s) should peruse the SDI paper template and make the necessary adjustments.</p> <p>Discussion The discussion is too long with a lot of overemphasis on some issues, making it a little bit boring.</p>	<p>As suggested the results generated have been converted into past tense.</p> <p>Font sizes have been removed as suggested.</p> <p>P value expressions have been adjusted as suggested.</p> <p>Discussion part has been shortened as far as practicable.</p>