



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 39749

Title: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CURRENT GUIDELINES FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF NON-ALCOHOLIC FATTY LIVER DISEASE

Reviewer’s code: 00812852

Reviewer’s country: Iran

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-05-10

Date reviewed: 2018-05-11

Review time: 1 Day

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article is of interest but needs to be more clear. The English needs some minor polishing . The main problem is using the exact words and not changing them to a more comparable statements . This makes the main purpose of the writers not achievable.



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Tables could have less texts in this regards. The part on definition is devoted mostly to the amount of alcohol ingestion . I think there should be section on ethanol ingestion as an exclusion and another one on true definition. I think there is a vague definition in all of the mentioned guidelines both for fatty liver and NASH. The use of S score in elastography was not discussed . Explanation of the Fatty Liver Index (FLI) [20] and the NAFLD liver fat score could make the manuscript more understandable as many readers in north America might not know about them.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- [] The same title
- [] Duplicate publication
- [] Plagiarism
- [Y] No

BPG Search:

- [] The same title
- [] Duplicate publication
- [] Plagiarism
- [Y] No



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 39749

Title: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CURRENT GUIDELINES FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF NON-ALCOHOLIC FATTY LIVER DISEASE

Reviewer’s code: 02926997

Reviewer’s country: Iran

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-05-10

Date reviewed: 2018-05-12

Review time: 1 Day

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> General
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Associate Editor, Thank you for sending me the article entitled “COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CURRENT GUIDELINES FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF NON-ALCOHOLIC FATTY LIVER DISEASE” for review. This review compared five



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

recent clinical guidelines for the diagnosis and management of NAFLD. The method of review seems to be scientific. The comparisons of results are well demonstrated in the tables. In my opinion this is a well written paper and could be published in the current form.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 39749

Title: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CURRENT GUIDELINES FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF NON-ALCOHOLIC FATTY LIVER DISEASE

Reviewer's code: 00030389

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-05-10

Date reviewed: 2018-05-13

Review time: 3 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors described the comparative analysis of the most recent international guidelines for the management of NAFLD. They showed some common orientation between the different recommendations, as well as diverging points. This kind of the



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

review will be a benefit for readers to understand the management of NAFLD easily. I have only a minor comment. A minor comment. #1. 3) WHICH IS THE ROLE - - -S? Noninvasive predictor biomarkers - - -. The current absence - - - is leading "a" to considerable - - - and "a" to the development - - -. What do these "a"s mean?

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 39749

Title: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CURRENT GUIDELINES FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF NON-ALCOHOLIC FATTY LIVER DISEASE

Reviewer's code: 01806467

Reviewer's country: South Korea

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-05-10

Date reviewed: 2018-05-17

Review time: 7 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> General
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper submitted by Leoni et al. systemically reviewed the five non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) guidelines that are strictly focusing on the topics of diagnosis and management of NAFLD. The guidelines examined are EASL, NICE, ASIA-PACIFIC,



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

AISF, and AASLD. The authors explored the similarities and differences in the light of the possible evolution of NAFLD in the following year. The definition of NAFLD, screening strategies in high-risk populations, non-invasive biomarkers for the assessment of advanced fibrosis, follow-up protocols, and treatment modalities were widely examined. Despite the fact that the paper is devoid of novel findings, the paper deserves some attention for its thoroughness and being informative. The authors may consider having some tables showing the differences in invasive assessment of fibrosis and follow-up protocols which would enhance the understanding of the article. Last but not least, the paper looks more of a systemic review than a comparative analysis to me so revising the title is recommended.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No