

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**Manuscript NO:** 71602

**Title:** Validation Model of Fibrosis-8 Index Score to Predict Significant Fibrosis Among Patients with Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 01805500

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** CCST, MD

**Professional title:** Adjunct Professor, Professor, Research Scientist, Senior Researcher, Senior Scientist, Teacher

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-09-14

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-09-14 18:37

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-09-15 15:43

**Review time:** 21 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection

<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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

Authors should lessen of importance the statement .....the detection of significant fibrosis is crucial for NAFLD management...because there no well-accepted and proven therapy for this very common disease, due to the fact that the inner mechanisms underlying NAFLD are far from being clarified as evident in...J. Clin. Med. 2020, 9(1), 15; <https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm9010015>. The authors are requested to explain how the cut-offs were determined. By the Youden Index?

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**Manuscript NO:** 71602

**Title:** Validation Model of Fibrosis-8 Index Score to Predict Significant Fibrosis Among Patients with Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03538879

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Chief Doctor, Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-09-14

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-09-15 07:08

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-09-23 00:27

**Review time:** 7 Days and 17 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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>

**Peer-reviewer  
statements**

Peer-Review: ☒ Anonymous ☐ Onymous

Conflicts-of-Interest: ☐ Yes ☒ No

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This is a good work regarding the verification of FIB-8 in NAFLD patients. A total of 511 biopsy-proven NAFLD patients were included. The work flow is clear, and the manuscript is easy understood. I only have a minor question. How the age stratification was determined? The sample size seemed to be too small to receive meaningful results.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**Manuscript NO:** 71602

**Title:** Validation Model of Fibrosis-8 Index Score to Predict Significant Fibrosis Among Patients with Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02540514

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Chief Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-09-14

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-09-15 08:01

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-09-24 11:21

**Review time:** 9 Days and 3 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="radio"/> ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="radio"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript reports interesting data regarding a new FIB-8 score as extension of the known FIB-4 score for liver fibrosis. While the AUROC show that FIB-8 seems to be superior to FIB-4 and NFS, the authors did not find statistical superiority over FIB-4.

Major remarks: 1. The original FIB-8 development study is cited only as abstract and obviously not published so far as full paper. This is very strange. Since some authors are identical, the authors have to give the reason for this and should also send drafts of the full paper. 2. FIB-4 is much better in the study population than NFS, which does not mirror other study results. The authors should discuss possible reasons. 3. There is a clear tendency (AUROC AND statistics) that FIB-8- is better than FIB-4. The authors only state that there was "no significant difference" which is correct but misleading. 4. FIB-8 is not useful for primary physicians due to certain values. What does that mean for screening with FIB-8? 5. There is a high proportion of patients above the high cut-off. Why is that? This seems to contribute to the relatively bad specificity of FIB-8. 6. Surprisingly, there are still many errors in grammar and spelling though the authors present a language certificate. Please explain and correct thoroughly all errors.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**Manuscript NO:** 71602

**Title:** Validation Model of Fibrosis-8 Index Score to Predict Significant Fibrosis Among Patients with Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02536349

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor, Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-09-14

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-09-14 18:09

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-09-25 20:45

**Review time:** 11 Days and 2 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="radio"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="radio"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The manuscript focuses on modulating FIB-4 for better prediction. It has some grammar and punctuation issues (e.g. Our study ad limitations) (In literature section punctuation errors and different styles) that should be revised and corrected before publication. Despite FIB-8 is at least non-inferior and insignificantly superior to FIB-4, further formulations of new indexes are encouraged.