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### Compulsory REVISION comments

- The Abstract is a structured abstract.
  - The Aims subsection should only include the goal or goals of the study.
  - The results subsection should only include the most important findings; it should not include parts of the methodology.
- The Materials and Methods section is well described and detailed.
- The Results section should be revised. There are several paragraphs in which the words “these” and “this” are repeatedly used. Therefore, it is difficult to understand to what the authors are referring to.
- The information presented in tables is well summarized.
- The conclusion is based on the information presented on the manuscript.

### Minor REVISION comments

- Look for the correct use of some words in English:
  - Line 54: “The aim of this review is to provide a solid staring point (...).”
  - Lines 129-131: “e.g.” is written twice in the sentence.
  - Line 203: “20 studies described...”
The word *alternate* is a verb.

- **Line 321:** “The majority of the studies *was* retrospective (...).” Incorrect verb conjugation.
- **Line 324:** “In some studies it was not clear why the indicators *where* not associated (...).” Incorrect use of *which* and *that*. Incorrect use of *where* and *were*.
- **Line 366:** “In *general* none indicator appears (...).” Incorrect use of *none*, *non*- and *no*.

### Fragment consider revising:

- **Lines 243-244:** One study and 1 other study found negative association and no association with mortality in univariate analysis, respectively.
- **Lines 298-299:** “One of our goals at the *start of the review* was to present the results in a synthetic and quantitative way.” The word *synthetic* refers to something made artificially or that is not genuine.
- **Lines 311-312:** “This study provides a good overview of both the commonly used indicators (like bilirubin, age, HE, PT, INR) as well as less frequent (*hopefully promising*) indicators.”
- **Lines 340-343:** “It remains intriguing why the direction of the association in various studies was incompatible, e.g. 2 studies [21], [38] reported positive association with mortality for *male* sex but 1 study [6] negative association. One explanation might be the differences in the aetiology: *viral* in [21], [38] and *non-viral* in [6].”
- **Lines 250-252:** “One study [8] found this association only when comparing survivors with deceased patients, but this association was not found when the deceased group was *extended*...”
| Optional/General comments | This is an exhaustive review of the literature on the prognostic indicators on acute liver failure and their predictive value for poor outcome. This article is interesting and original as it collects and summarizes important information about one disease and its predictors. The content is overall and elaborated from a clear gap in knowledge. This article is worth to be published after the grammatical mistakes are revised and corrected. |
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