

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 37676

Title: Digital liver biopsy: standardized bio-imaging for translational and clinical research on fatty liver

Reviewer's code: 00053659

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-01-04

Date reviewed: 2018-01-05

Review time: 16 Hours

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Mancini et al. reviewed various imaging modalities for assessing fatty liver. The manuscript is well written and the entire concept is interesting. But samples of each image and the differences among the modalities are hardly understood. Please add representative images for each tool and add table that represents diagnostic values such as AUC or c-statistics. Minor point. Author contributions could hardly understand what each author contributed equally. Please identify the section where each author provides it. Company name is missing for Fibroscan.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 37676

Title: Digital liver biopsy: standardized bio-imaging for translational and clinical research on fatty liver

Reviewer's code: 01555255

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-01-04

Date reviewed: 2018-01-08

Review time: 4 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[Y] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[] Accept
[] Grade B: Very good	[] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[] The same title	[] High priority for publication
[] Grade C: Good	[] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[] Duplicate publication	[] Rejection
[] Grade D: Fair	[] Grade D: Rejected	[Y] No	[Y] Minor revision
[] Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	[] Major revision
		[] The same title	
		[] Duplicate publication	
		[] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

- Liver elastography section: elastography is an easy, non invasive and well accepted tool to evaluate the degree of liver diseases in general and of NAFLD/NASH in particular. A review report the elastographic cut-off to define different degrees of the disease (Abenavoli et al. Ann Hepatol 2012). In this section i also suggest to briefly report the role of ARFI. - Intrahepatic fat measured by ultrasound (US) section: literature report the accuracy of US score to define the fatt accumulation on the liver (e.g. Hamaguchi et al. Am J Gastroenterol. 2007). I suggest to brief report the most important US score. - Conclusion section: this section is pivotal for the reader. I suggest the Author to highlight the point that the described techniques present a real clinical impact in NAFLD management. However, many of these tools are limited in selected Centers. In this way, is important to increase the accessibility by reducing the costs.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 37676

Title: Digital liver biopsy: standardized bio-imaging for translational and clinical research on fatty liver

Reviewer's code: 01919991

Reviewer's country: Afghanistan

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-01-04

Date reviewed: 2018-01-09

Review time: 5 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is well written in the whole and follows a logical projection, with general views of different imaging approaches useful in the diagnosis and staging fatty liver disease and, in a wider view, liver disease progression. I suggest that the authors emphasize the benefits of adopting a common image acquisition and processing standard in their conclusions. A careful check for typos is recommended

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 37676

Title: Digital liver biopsy: standardized bio-imaging for translational and clinical research on fatty liver

Reviewer's code: 02441021

Reviewer's country: Egypt

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-01-04

Date reviewed: 2018-01-11

Review time: 7 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Needs better division into shorter, concised paragraphs