

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 61192

Title: Imaging presentation and postoperative recurrence of peliosis hepatis: A case report

Reviewer's code: 05180942

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, MSc

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-12-07

Reviewer chosen by: Man Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-08 16:52

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-08 18:07

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Title is reflect the main subject of the manuscript 2. The abstract is summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript 3. Key words are reflect the focus of the manuscript 4. Background is adequately describe the Manuscript 5.The manuscript interprets the findings sufficientand appropriately, briefly emphasizing key points. The discussion is being handled correctly. 6. The figures are adequate and properly explain the paper content. It would be appropriate to point all lesions with an arrow in Figure 3b. 7. The article cites reliable references appropriately. 8. The article organization and presentation quality is well laid out, concise and consistent 9. The article has been prepared according to CARE Checklist (2016).