

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 80031

Title: Factors other than fibrosis that increase measured shear wave velocity

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03805228

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Attending Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-14

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-16 01:45

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-29 06:50

Review time: 13 Days and 5 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. This minireview reviewed factors other than fibrosis that increase measured shear wave velocity, including conditions that appear to increase the viscous component and conditions that appear to increase tissue density. It is important to judge shear wave elastography results in the context of the entire clinical picture. 2. About Fig 1-10, are these figures from the authors' hospital? can the representative case really represent this condition's SW results? According to my knowledge, fatty liver is usually has the similar SWV with normal liver. this should be explained in the manuscript.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 80031

Title: Factors other than fibrosis that increase measured shear wave velocity

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06366731

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Lecturer

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Thailand

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-14

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-07 09:27

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-08 15:52

Review time: 1 Day and 6 Hours

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 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
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this review, Naganuma and Ishida have presented potential confounding factors that can influence measurement of liver fibrosis by two-dimensional shear wave elastography (2DSWE). The scope of the review is important for clinicians and scientists to be aware of these confounding factors and push new development to overcome these challenges. The review is well-written and easy to follow the arguments. The authors provide sufficient basic background and present specific examples from various studies to appreciate cautions associated with interpretation of the 2DSWE results. I have some minor comments/questions to improve this manuscript mostly regarding the presentation of the figures. 1. There are too many figures for a mini review. Is it possible to combine examples of 2DSWE results from different scenarios into a single figure. Is it possible to remove some examples that are redundant? Perhaps present one example from the cases related to increased tissue viscosity and another example from the cases related to increased tissue density? 2. Are 2DSWE results shown in the figures from other studies? If so, you should put references accordingly in the figure legends. 3. I feel that Figure 12 should be presented earlier before Figure 11 which is the summary of this review. Is it supposed to be Figure 2? (See next comment) 4. This issue of hepatomegaly in 2DSWE has not explicitly mentioned in the main text but appears in the Figure 2, and in the main text, Figure 2 is said to be an example of acute hepatitis, which is basically Figure 12. Please clarify the confusion here. Does hepatomegaly have an impact on 2DSWE?

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 80031

Title: Factors other than fibrosis that increase measured shear wave velocity

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03805228

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Attending Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-14

Reviewer chosen by: Ze-Mao Gong

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-03 10:29

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-04 05:43

Review time: 19 Hours

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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Some careless errors were found in this paper. The figures and the fulltext need to be checked by the authors thoroughly.