

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Hepatology*

**Manuscript NO:** 92360

**Title:** Metabolic dysfunction-associated Steatotic Liver Disease (MASLD): A Silent Pandemic

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05466290

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MSc, RN

**Professional title:** Research Scientist, Senior Lecturer, Senior Researcher

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2024-01-23

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2024-01-24 07:02

**Reviewer performed review:** 2024-01-24 09:25

**Review time:** 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" 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

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<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>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is both timely and well-composed. However, I would like to suggest a reconsideration of its classification and reference count. In my view, it seems more appropriately categorized as a rapid or mini-review, rather than an editorial, especially given its extensive list of 59 references and 3600+ words.