



**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:** 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	<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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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. 2 The diagnostic system should be introduced about its accuracy and pitfalls, especially MR image features under the background of clinical practice. 3 The images provided are all solitary lesions with relatively clear border, but other HCC types of gross anatomy should be included. 4 Typo and grammatical errors exist.

## 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 polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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. 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 authors have used a lot of figures but in this case I believe that they help demonstrate the text and are therefore largely justified.

## 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y] 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.