

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 54743

Title: Analysis of magnetic resonance imaging misdiagnosis before operation to minimal-fat angiomyolipoma

Reviewer's code: 01133666

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: FEBS, MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Research Scientist, Senior Research Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-02-24

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-02-25 03:29

Reviewer performed review: 2020-03-15 02:49

Review time: 18 Days and 23 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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

There are certain angiomyolipomas lack a sufficient amount of fat or the certain angiomyolipomas do not contain adipose tissue which cannot be distinguished by the naked eye on MRI. These angiomyolipomas are called minimal-fat angiomyolipoma because they are lack of typical angiomyolipoma imaging characteristic and are often misdiagnosed as renal cell carcinoma before surgery, thus causing worthless surgical removal of the carcinoma. And it brings unnecessary burden to the patients. In this study, the authors analyzed the MRI imaging features of minimal-fat angiomyolipoma and the causes of misdiagnosis by MRI before operation. Overall the study is very interesting. 1. Title reflects the main subject of the manuscript. 2. Abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript. 3. Key words reflects the focus of the manuscript. 4. Methods are clearly described in detail. Examination method are reasonable. 5. Results are well display. Table and figure are good, a minor editing is required for table 1. 6. Discussion. Reasonable. A little long. Please short it. 7. References are updated. Format requires update according to the journal's guideline. 8. Manuscript overall is well written. A minor language polishing should be corrected.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 54743

Title: Analysis of magnetic resonance imaging misdiagnosis before operation to minimal-fat angiomyolipoma

Reviewer's code: 02856362

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: FASGE, MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-02-24

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-02-24 10:23

Reviewer performed review: 2020-03-15 03:13

Review time: 19 Days and 16 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 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



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

THIS IS AN INTERESTING STUDY ABOUT THE MRI MISDIAGNOSIS BEFORE OPERATION TO MINIMAL-FAT ANGIOMYOLIPOMA. THIS STUDY IS WELL WRITTEN, AND I RECOMMENTD TO ACCEPT IT AFTER A MINOR LANGUAGE EDITING. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 54743

Title: Analysis of magnetic resonance imaging misdiagnosis before operation to minimal-fat angiomyolipoma

Reviewer's code: 02460097

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: FACC, FACP, MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Professor, Research Scientist, Senior Lecturer

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-02-24

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-02-25 03:41

Reviewer performed review: 2020-03-15 03:15

Review time: 18 Days and 23 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" 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 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

well designed study with interesting results. please short the discussion. a minor language editing is required.