

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 65736

Title: Screening for nonalcoholic fatty liver disease - when, who and how?

Reviewer's code: 05465517

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Russia

Author's Country/Territory: Germany

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-16

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-17 14:56

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-04 17:36

Review time: 18 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 Grade E: Do not publish
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 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
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

1. The title of the manuscript completely reflects its main subject 2. The abstract summarizes and reflects the described in the manuscript content 3. The key words are suitable 4. 4-7: This manuscript is a review article, which is written according to the rules. The key points are clearly defining: who should be screen to NAFLD and how. The authors analyzed all pros and cons of screening for NAFLD, identified groups at particular risk of developing this disease, existing methods for assessing NAFLD, considering their availability, cost and effectiveness. The review has critical discussion on each item. The authors express their own position on the need for screening for NAFLD. The review analyzes the problem, but does not provide an unambiguous proposal for its solution. 5. The illustrations are good quality, understandable, illustrate content, have legends 6. Statistic is based on analysis of literature data and reliable sources 7. The manuscript meets the requirement use of SI units 8. The references sited correctly 9. The language, grammar and style are accurate and appropriate 10.

The manuscript meets the requirements of ethics The presented review makes it possible to take the next steps to practically solve the problem of screening to NAFLD