

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 77894

**Title:** Hepatic steatosis with mass effect: A case report

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03258338

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-05-27

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-06-25 10:53

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-07-08 17:05

**Review time:** 13 Days and 6 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish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

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for the opportunity to review this article. In this work, the authors present a case of hepatic steatosis presenting with mass effect. Authors suggest that RMN is valuable for differential diagnosis with fat-rich tumors. The paper is well written and contains a topic that is very frequently addressed in ultrasound practice. Major comments and revision: 1. Authors say in background that "there is no report of hepatic steatosis with mass effect in literature". later, in discussion, they claim that "it is extremely rare". So: is it rare or does it not exist? In the second case, it is correct to explain and report more deeply other reports. 2. In a work in which hepatic steatosis is discussed, it is not possible not to refer to the ultrasound method in the specific case and with respect to the conclusions. 3. Re-order discussion, addressing first of all the crucial point of the work and the report, then going back to the pathophysiology of steatosis (But more synthetically) and finally reporting well the similar cases (if any) and strengths and weaknesses of the different methods.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 77894

**Title:** Hepatic steatosis with mass effect: A case report

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03699961

**Position:** Associate Editor

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Japan

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-05-27

**Reviewer chosen by:** Dong-Mei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-07-11 08:08

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-07-16 03:01

**Review time:** 4 Days and 18 Hours

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

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Title: Hepatic steatosis with mass effect: a case report Na Hu, Shijun Su, Jinye Li, et al.

General Comments The authors reported a case with a liver tumor over 10 cm without background chronic liver diseases. Based on the characteristic features that were observed in MRI images and immunohistochemical studies, hepatic steatosis was diagnosed. Although the authors raised the T1-weighted in-and out-of-phase images as the most valuable information to make differential diagnosis, there are other valuable information which should be presented and discussed for the better understanding and management of a future case with liver tumors. The followings are several concerns that the authors may wish to consider:

1) Specific comments Major concerns: 1. Hemodynamics and results of immunohistochemistry should be helpful information. Please present images in a dynamic study using contrast medium and discuss the results of immunohistochemistry to make differential diagnosis. In addition, it is crucial to discuss thoughtfully if a surgical resection had to be made in this case and would be recommended in a case with liver tumors showing similar characteristics with this case.

Minor concerns: 1. Laboratory findings should be presented by showing actual values.

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 77894

**Title:** Hepatic steatosis with mass effect: A case report

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03258338

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-05-27

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ji-Hong Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-08-31 21:56

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-08-31 22:01

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Thanks to Authors and Editors. After these revisions, I think that manuscript can be accepted for publication. Best regards, PG