

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Hepatology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRHE_110628
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison Of GFR Determined By Using Serum Cystatin C And Serum Creatinine Concentration Alone And In Combination For Diagnosis Of Hepatorenal Syndrome
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, it helps to improve the diagnosis of HRS, but limitations still exist due to Cys C, which is inconvenient in every setting</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. Yes</p> <p>7. How many people are in this study actually? There are different descriptions in many parts. In abstract, it was mentioned 60 patients but in methodology and results showed 50 patients.</p> <p>8. Page 2 introduction part, ...HRS is found in 10-13% of such patients and appears to be an extension of pathophysiology of prerenal azotaemia and therefore potentially reversible. I would turn the arguments: HRS can not turn reversible because it has progressed to end-stage liver. The cause of renal failure cannot be eliminated.</p> <p>9. Page 3 methodology, statistical analysis should include how to perform multivariable regression analysis (Table 5) and subgroup analysis (Table 3).</p> <p>10. Page 3 results, as mentioned, age and sex were used for matching, but the mean age and percentage of sex between the two groups showed differences. How effective is the matching process?</p> <p>11. Page 4 table 1, the separation of baseline characteristics between the case and control groups in each column is preferable, and p-values from statistical tests should be added to this table. There are many confounding factors to measurement creatinine such as BMI age sex and others so these factors should be showed the results between groups in table 1.</p> <p>12. Page 4 table 1, TC (cumm) needs to be spelled out and there are no results in ascitic fluid.</p> <p>13. Page 5 table 3, the number of patients is not correct in subgroup analysis with CTP B and</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

	<p>C. As mentioned above, how many people are in this study actually? Table 3 showed 26 patients in case group and 24 patients in control group.</p> <p>14. Page 3 methodology, which creatinine values were used to calculate MDRD and CKD-EPI? There are many serum creatinine values reported for one patient because of data from IPD and OPD. Was serum creatinine used during the development of AKI in the patient?</p> <p>15. Are there any patients with CKD in this study? The MDRD equation shows precision of the GFR evaluation only in patients with GFR <60 ml/min and CKD is a confounding factor for GFR calculations. If it exists, please show the percentage of CKD between the groups.</p> <p>16. Page 7 discussion, the median serum creatinine and cystatin C, divided by sex, should be mentioned in the results section.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	-	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Warunee Mingpun
Department, University & Country	Chiang Mai University, Thailand