Reviewer's report

Title: Portal Vein Thrombosis; Risk factors, Clinical presentation and Treatment.

Version: 2 Date: 7 May 2007

Reviewer: Angelo Andriulli

Reviewer's report:

General

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct) I found the Results would need a thorough revision to include the following changes:

- 1st and 2nd paragraphs: The Authors state that the "mean follow up time from admission....
As the study was retrospective in nature, a more sound statement would be: Meal time elapsed from admission....
- The paragraph on Risk factors does not appear to deliver its message properly. Indeed, the study reports data on 67 patients. However, by adding 43 to 28 cases the total is 71! I do not understand the sentence: analyses on patients without cancer or cirrhosis differed with 27 cases... and 24 cases: here again the total number is 51, while it has been said that these patients totalled 48 in numbers.
- 3rd paragraph: as only 6 patients had been evaluated by MRI, it seems useless to report data on sensitivity of MRI.
- By adding 54%, to 42% and 31% the total is higher than 100%: please, clarify
- page 8, 3rd paragraph, line 4: insert were after cirrhosis
- page 9: renal insufficiency
- page 9: Mortality appears primarily to depend...... but is in most other cases fairly good. How can mortality be fairly good? Please, check he English
- page 10: "of 10 patients with lower gastrointestinal bleeding in our study 40 percentages had"... here again I would suggest to rewrite the sentence
Table 1: I do not understand what "sectio/cholecystit" stands for. Also Ideopathic is misspelled

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Reject because too small an advance to publish

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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