

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/dmr-21-46>

Review Comments

++ *The title of the article is misleading - The study is simply comparing characteristics between two groups - those denied versus those accepted for LT among patients AH diagnosed patients. But the title solely focuses on the social support component which is only coming out of Table 4.*

We have changed our manuscript title to better reflect the content of the paper.

In the abstract, under methods - add important info. such as study design, study sample, comparator groups etc.

We updated our Abstract.

++ *“Thus, if we are to augment the potential candidacy with AH to be eligible for life saving LT, greater understanding is needed of their social support”*

We have updated the sentence for clarity.

++ *Last paragraph under introduction – “Our hypothesis ----- patient selection committee.” This section is absolutely unclear and needs to be rephrased.*

Section removed for clarity

- *What do you mean by “our aim is to define social support in patients with AH in denied candidates”? As I understand from the results - social support in AH diagnosed patients was defined for both, accepted as well as denied categories (Table 4)*

Section re-written for clarity

- *Further what do you mean by “match with patients accepted and denied for LT in general ”?*

Section removed for clarity

++ *Methods - “Beginning in September 2019 -----Alcohol abstinence of less than six months”*

How is this information that relevant for the current study? is this needed here?

++ *Was there any specific reason that median / IQR were reported instead of mean /SD? Did you check for normal distribution or did you observe a lot of variability in the data values? Accordingly, would suggest adding a statement around data distribution under statistical analysis justifying the choice of your summary statistics. OR the other way is to provide mean /SD values also in the tables - suggesting after reading the language in discussion section.*

A biostatistician from the University of California Los Angeles assisted with analysis. Median were used because of data not normally distributed. A statement was included in the methods regarding the choice of using of median values to describe the data.

++ *Results - why no p-values for table 4?*

Because of small numbers for some comparisons (N=3), we felt the data was descriptive, and the use of statistics will be misleading.

++ *Discussion –Needs significant rewriting*

The entire Discussion reviewed for accuracy and clarity.

- *1st para - 2nd statement – “This retrospective single center study exposes potential barriers to Lt that may exist history of alcohol relapse” It would be incorrect to make such statements.*

Sentence removed for accuracy.

- *3rd para – 1st statement – “Analysis of our study data sheds light on 1st degree social support being highly influential in determining LT eligibility” Again, this statement is incorrect given the lack of inferential statistics. The chi-square test cannot decide the likelihood of getting LT acceptance.*

We have removed this statement for accuracy.

++ *Limitations section - it is not the retrospective nature of this study that limited detection of statistically significant differences, instead the very small sample size. One of the most important limitations here is the lack of inferential statistics. The study is purely descriptive in nature and does not provide any insight around association of factors like social support with LT status.*

The Limitation section has been re-written for accuracy and clarity.

Also, would like to recommend to the research team to consult with a statistician or biostatistician who can help in correct interpretation of the results.

A biostatistician from the University of California Los Angeles assisted with the analysis.