

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_99393
Title of the Manuscript:	Utility of Lactate to Bilirubin Index in predicting mortality in Acute on Chronic Liver Failure- a single centered study
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:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

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. Indeed, because the Lactate Bilirubin Index (LBI) helps to predict mortality in this aimed population (ACLF) with important economic impact on the health care system of a country.</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes, because not only is the abstract easy to get it, but it also achieves the proposed objectives.</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. Yes, correlating the clinical and laboratory data, LBI score > or equal to 11.8 demonstrated sensitivity, specificity and accuracy as a predictor of mortality in ACFL within 30 days.</p> <p>6. Yes</p> <p>There are no suggestions from the reviewer.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, it is but I could find grammar mistakes.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Introduction:</p> <p>Page 2: to delete period in "causes of death. The"</p> <p>Page 3: Grammar mistake: does is that it doesn't includes the cause of cirrhosis.</p> <p>Page 3: Pay attention to metric sequence to avoid unnecessary (positive predictive value (PPV), negative predictive value (NPV))</p> <p>Results:</p> <p>Page 6: Grammar mistake: Mean age of the patients was 35.1 ±16.8</p> <p>Page 6: Mention abbreviation meaning (while HE was seen in 49)</p> <p>Table 1: Baseline characteristics of the patients with ACLF (n=159): Pay attention to the configuration</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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Roseane Pôrto Medeiros
Department, University & Country	University of São Paulo, Brazil