

Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for investing your time to evaluate our manuscript, and considering its acceptance after proper revision. We would also like to thank the reviewers for their helpful suggestions and for giving us the opportunity to improve our manuscript.

We believe we have specifically addressed all issues outlined by the reviewers.

We hope that you will find our work sufficiently interesting to merit publication in your journal.

Thank you.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

Manuscript NO: 37710

Title: MR Imaging Ancillary Features Used in LI-RADS - An Illustrative Review

Reviewer's code: 02527528

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-01-02

Date reviewed: 2018-01-02

Review time: 4 Hours

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1 These features should be summarized in a table and described with situations in which a feature is helpful or not. The important features must be mentioned in the conclusion section, otherwise the merit of the article is limited.

[We have done this as suggested.](#)

2 The diagnostic system should be introduced about its accuracy and pitfalls, especially MR image features under the background of clinical practice.

[We introduced a new paragraph regarding this issue.](#)

[LI-RADS, like any other imaging-based diagnostic systems, does have limitations and problems to be addressed. Nevertheless, LI-RADS is being continually refined and updated in response to advances in research and technology. With current level of development, LI-RADS is mainly used to separate the diagnosis of HCC \(LR-5\) and the diagnosis of non-HCC nodules \(LR-1 and 2\). Another very important application is reserved for LR-4 and LR-3 categories, specifically, to adapt patient management, including a more aggressive approach or undergo elective biopsy in patients with ancillary findings that favor HCC or malignancy.](#)

3 The images provided are all solitary lesions with relatively clear border, but other HCC types of gross anatomy should be included.

This is another challenging area. The images that we have showed are related to the ancillary imaging feature being described.

[We agree that other types of atypical HCC exist, especially multifocal or diffuse HCC, however as far as we know, there aren't recognized ancillary features described to aid in their diagnosis. In general, radiologists should use their judgment, and while carefully evaluating images in a lesion-by-lesion basis, it is important to decide when to report lesions individually and when to report lesions in aggregate.](#)

4 Typo and grammatical errors exist.

[The manuscript was edited and later proofread by a professional English language editing company.](#)



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https:// www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

Manuscript NO: 37710

Title: MR Imaging Ancillary Features Used in LI-RADS - An Illustrative Review

Reviewer's code: 00053888

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-01-02

Date reviewed: 2018-01-02

Review time: 10 Hours

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have reviewed the radiological features that help diagnose early HCC. This is a useful manuscript that will help clinicians in planning for such patients. There are however a number of problems that need addressing.

The introduction is too long and rambling, it could be shortened to make the manuscript easier to read.

We have attempted to decrease the Introduction, but this is offset by requested changes in response to reviewer comments.

The manuscript is littered with grammatical & typographical errors. The authors seem to have a desire to add 'ity' to the end of a number of words which make words that are grammatically incorrect. One example is benignity. There is also a lack of hyphens in words such as peri- and intra-. These are only two examples there are other grammatical problems throughout the text.

[The manuscript was edited and later proofread by a professional English language editing company.](#)

The authors have used a lot of figures but in this case I believe that they help demonstrate the text and are therefore largely justified.

[Thanks.](#)

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

Manuscript NO: 37710

Title: MR Imaging Ancillary Features Used in LI-RADS - An Illustrative Review

Reviewer's code: 03656588

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-01-02

Date reviewed: 2018-01-05

Review time: 2 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y] Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1) Ancillary-imaging features have been reviewed and illustrated to describe and incorporate into clinical reports, especially in Liver Imaging Reporting and Data System (LI-RADS) in the manuscript. The non-specific, specific features and values suggesting malignancy were respectively illustrated. It is important guidance to know about the diagnostic value of ancillary-imaging features in the differentiation of HCC from nonmalignant nodules. 2) The description are concise and to the point, strong logic. 3) I suggest that the manuscript can be published in the form of minireviews in World J Radiology.

[Thank you for your comments.](#)