

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 89430

Title: Current status of magnetic resonance imaging radiomics in hepatocellular carcinoma: A quantitative review with Radiomics Quality Score

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 07716706

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-31

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-07 02:30

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-14 15:53

Review time: 7 Days and 13 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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[Y] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting manuscript. In this manuscript, authors attempt to summarize the current status of MRI radiomic studies concerning HCC, evaluating the radiomics analysis conducted in previous articles by means of RQS to assess the quality of the methodology used in each study. Authors consulted a large number of articles and classified and analyzed them. The results showed that MRI radiomics could provide information about the diagnosis, prognosis, and prediction of pathologic outcomes and molecular expression for the management of HCC. RQS was positively correlated with journal Impact Factor, 5-years Impact Factor, number of patients involved, number of radiomics features extracted and time of publication in the study. MRI radiomics can potentially satisfy the urgent need for noninvasive, radiation-free strategies. This study showed us a better and more comprehensive use case of MRI radiomics for HCC patients. However, the study also revealed that studies in this field still lack the quality required to allow its introduction in clinical practice. It will definitely increase the quality of the manuscript if the number of included patients and the number of extracted features can be increased. In particular, external validation and the standardization of



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

radiomics features are necessary. On the whole, I think it's a very valuable manuscript and this study provides a new idea of taking advantage of the benefits arising from MRI technique in HCC.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 89430

Title: Current status of magnetic resonance imaging radiomics in hepatocellular carcinoma: A quantitative review with Radiomics Quality Score

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05995074

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-31

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-07 08:10

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-16 10:19

Review time: 9 Days and 2 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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] Grade A: Excellent [<input type="checkbox"/>] Grade B: Good [<input type="checkbox"/>] Grade C: Fair [<input type="checkbox"/>] Grade D: No scientific significance
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>] Accept (High priority) [<input 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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I read with great interest the paper “Current status of MRI radiomics in hepatocellular carcinoma: a quantitative review with radiomics quality score” by Brancato V et al. This is an interesting systematic review and has a significant amount of work. The authors assessed the quality of MRI radiomic studies concerning HCC using the radiomics quality score (RQS). The authors concluded that studies in this field still lack the quality required to allow its introduction in clinical practice. I suggest publication of the paper. Below are just some minor comments. 1. In Method, there is a need to mention that 0% indicates the lowest quality and 100% is the highest, especially for readers not familiar with RQS. 2. The subheading “Statistical analysis” in Result is not appropriate. It is about correlation between RQS and journal metrics.