

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Paediatrics Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Incidence and outcome of biliary atresia in Shanghai, China from 2015 to 2016: a cohort study
AUTHORS	Yang, Yifan; Dong, Rui; Chen, Gong; Zheng, Shan; Yan, Weili; Shen, Zhen

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER NAME	<i>Mark Davenport</i>
REVIEWER AFFILIATION	
REVIEWER CONFLICT OF INTEREST	I know members of this group personally so am unwilling to review given it is an open peer review system. I do not consent therefore.
DATE REVIEW RETURNED	04-Feb-2024

GENERAL COMMENTS	No comments
-------------------------	-------------

REVIEWER NAME	<i>Hideyuki Sasaki</i>
REVIEWER AFFILIATION	Miyagi Children's Hospital, Surgery
REVIEWER CONFLICT OF INTEREST	I have no competing interests to disclose.
DATE REVIEW RETURNED	15-Feb-2024

GENERAL COMMENTS	In this manuscript entitled "Incidence and outcome of biliary atresia in Shanghai, China from 2015 to 2016: a cohort study", the authors evaluate demographic characteristics and clinical data of all newly diagnosed biliary atresia in Shanghai. The manuscript is well-written, and the results are presented.
-------------------------	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Dear Linan Zeng and Shanti Raman

Thanks very much for your response with regard to our submitted manuscript entitled "Incidence and outcome of biliary atresia in Shanghai, China from 2015 to 2016: a cohort study". We very appreciate the useful and valuable suggestions from you and reviewers. The changes in the revised manuscript are highlighted using red color. We would like to resubmit this revised manuscript to BMJ Paediatrics Open and hope it is acceptable for publication in the journal. The point-by-point response to the referees are appended below.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER NAME	<i>Mureo Kasahara</i>
REVIEWER AFFILIATION	

REVIEWER CONFLICT OF INTEREST	None
DATE REVIEW RETURNED	08-Jul-2024

GENERAL COMMENTS	The paper is well revised and ovrthy for future publication.
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER NAME	<i>Henkjan Verkade</i>
REVIEWER AFFILIATION	Beatrix Children's Hospital, University Medical Center Groningen, Pediatric Gastroenterology and Hepatology
REVIEWER CONFLICT OF INTEREST	None
DATE REVIEW RETURNED	17-Jul-2024

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>The revised manuscript provides important information on the incidence of biliary atresia based on a large population and on the epidemiology of the disease up to the age of 2 years after Kasai surgery.</p> <p>This reviewer considers the data relevant and important to publish. Two suggestions for further improvement of the manuscript:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It would help to describe shortly why 6 out of 41 patients did not undergo Kasai portoenterostomy 2. the median time between first outpatient visit and Kasai portoenterostomy was 28 days (Table 1). Could the authors explain
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER NAME	<i>Kenneth Wong</i>
REVIEWER AFFILIATION	
REVIEWER CONFLICT OF INTEREST	None
DATE REVIEW RETURNED	18-Jul-2024

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This submission is a revised manuscript and I was not involved in the review of the original.</p> <p>Overall, although reasonably well written, I am not entirely sure of the whole purpose of the manuscript. Is this meant to be a piece of original research or a short letter only?</p> <p>If this is original research, then it is very thin on data. The abstract was not structured and there was no research question/hypothesis provided in the background.</p> <p>I am also not sure why this study time period was chosen. It just seems very random. In another publication by the same group of authors covering almost the same period, there were 613 patients as opposed to only 41 here:</p> <p>Jiang J, Wan R, He S, Wu Y, Shen Z, Chen G, Sun S, Yan W, Zheng S. Epidemiological characteristics and risk factors of biliary atresia: a case-control study. <i>BMJ Open</i>. 2021 Dec 13;11(12):e049354. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-049354.</p> <p>Why is there such big discrepancy ?</p> <p>As it stands, this current provides a single snapshot of a small number of patients and does not add very much new knowledge to existing literature.</p>
-------------------------	---

VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 3

Mureo Kasahara

Comments to the Author

The paper is well revised and worthy for future publication.

Response: Thank you again for valuable suggestion.

Reviewer: 4

Dr. Henkjan Verkade, Beatrix Children's Hospital, University Medical Center Groningen

Comments to the Author

The revised manuscript provides important information on the incidence of biliary atresia based on a large population and on the epidemiology of the disease up to the age of 2 years after Kasai surgery.

This reviewer considers the data relevant and important to publish. Two suggestions for further improvement of the manuscript:

1. It would help to describe shortly why 6 out of 41 patients did not undergo Kasai portoenterostomy.

Response: Thank you for your valuable suggestion. Three patients were over 120 days old at the time of biliary exploration. Due to the severe liver fibrosis, they were not suitable for the Kasai procedure. The other three children were diagnosed at 72, 86 and 94 days of age, respectively. Their parents lost confidence in the recovery after Kasai procedure, so they only requested an exploratory diagnosis and subsequently chose liver transplantation treatment. We added this part briefly in last paragraph.

2. the median time between first outpatient visit and Kasai portoenterostomy was 28 days (Table 1). Could the authors explain.

Response: The long interval between first outpatient and surgery was mainly due to the lack of awareness and recognition of BA by most primary medical staffs, and parents' hesitation about cholangiography and Kasai portoenterostomy at that time. Because there were no good diagnostic markers in 2015-2016, the vast majority of parents expressed resistance to surgical exploration and preferred conservative observation.

Reviewer: 5

Dr. Kenneth Wong

Comments to the Author

This submission is a revised manuscript and I was not involved in the review of the original.

Overall, although reasonably well written, I am not entirely sure of the whole purpose of the manuscript. Is this meant to be a piece of original research or a short letter only?

If this is original research, then it is very thin on data. The abstract was not structured and there was no research question/hypothesis provided in the background.

I am also not sure why this study time period was chosen. It just seems very random. In another publication by the same group of authors covering almost the same period, there were 613 patients as opposed to only 41 here:

Jiang J, Wan R, He S, Wu Y, Shen Z, Chen G, Sun S, Yan W, Zheng S. Epidemiological characteristics and risk factors of biliary atresia: a case-control study. *BMJ Open*. 2021 Dec 13;11(12):e049354. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-049354.

Why is there such big discrepancy?

Response: Thank you for comments. From 2015 to 2016, our team conducted a study on neonatal stool color card in Shanghai to evaluate the efficacy of screening BA in Chinese Mainland. Based on the results of the screening study at that time, we obtained the incidence of BA in Shanghai area. We further summarized demographic, clinical data, and 5-year survival status and reported them as a brief article. So, this study only included the BA population born in Shanghai (41 patients), while the article (Jiang J, et al.) published during the same period were included BA population (613 patients) from all over the country, who were treated in our center. Therefore, the number of patients in publication far exceeds the incidence of biliary atresia in Shanghai.

VERSION 3 – REVIEW

REVIEWER NAME	<i>Hideyuki Sasaki</i>
REVIEWER AFFILIATION	Miyagi Children's Hospital, Surgery
REVIEWER CONFLICT OF INTEREST	none
DATE REVIEW RETURNED	24-Aug-2024

GENERAL COMMENTS	The reviewer thinks this revised paper is well written and worthy for publication.
------------------	--

REVIEWER NAME	<i>Henkjan Verkade</i>
REVIEWER AFFILIATION	Beatrix Children's Hospital, University Medical Center Groningen, Pediatric Gastroenterology and Hepatology
REVIEWER CONFLICT OF INTEREST	No competing interests
DATE REVIEW RETURNED	15-Aug-2024

GENERAL COMMENTS	The authors have satisfactorily addressed all comments. No reservations against acceptance of the manuscript.
------------------	---