

Reviewer #1:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade D (Fair)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Major revision

**Specific Comments to Authors:** Title: Congenital hepatic cyst: A case series and literature review. Chunxia Du, Changgui Lu, Wei Li, Weibing Tang. 1) General Comments In this manuscript, the authors narratively presented own experience of eleven cases with perinatally-detected liver cysts and briefly reviewed the literature. Although the information is precious because of rare cases, the authors should select an appropriate journal style. If the authors focused on their own cases, narrative presentation should be made as a case report. Otherwise, the authors should complete through reviewing of the literature with their own cases.

**Answering reviewer #1: Thank you for your comments.**

1) We have revised the format of our manuscript according to the Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision and the Format for Manuscript Revision.

Reviewer #2:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade C (Good)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Major revision

**Specific Comments to Authors:** My Comments and Suggestions to Authors: 1- The abstract is not convincing and is disorganized, it should be refined to precisely illustrate what authors have done in this paper within 200 words. 2- This application topic has not received much attention in the literature. However, the study, literature review and presentation require substantial improvement in several respects. 3- Result and Discussion section is inadequate. Need more attention and better explanation. 4- Through my review of this manuscript, I did not notice the main contributions and there is no literature review. Please including a section for literature review to enhance the background knowledge of readers about existing schemes. Moreover, there are no Tables 1 and 2. Authors should review their manuscript well and re-check it. 5- There are many repetitions in sentences. 6- The conclusions in this manuscript are good. 7- References aren't formatted according to rules.

**Answering reviewer #2: Thank you for your comments.**

1 We have revised the abstract and it is now under 200 words.

2 We have revised our paper using the RCA database to find the latest highlight articles.

3 We have revised the result and discussion section according to the Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision and the Format for Manuscript Revision.

4 Table 1 and 2 have been added to the article.

5 The article has been polished up.

7 We have revised the references according to the Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision and the Format for Manuscript Revision.

## Round 2

**Specific Comments To Authors:** In this revision, the authors change the journal from World Journal of Gastroenterology to World Journal of Clinical Cases along with my suggestion. Unfortunately, however, the format of manuscript, especially “CASE PRESENTATION”, is quite poor. They are almost tables rather than text presentation. It is an effective way to summarize the data in tables, but cases must be described in text as drawing the discussion and conclusion. Before reviewing the content of the revised manuscript, it is necessary making major revision. **Major concerns:** In this revision, the authors change the journal from World Journal of Gastroenterology to World Journal of Clinical Cases along with my suggestion. Unfortunately, however, the format of manuscript, especially “CASE PRESENTATION”, is quite poor. They are almost tables rather than a text presentation. It is an effective way to summarize the data in tables, but cases must be described in text as connecting with the discussion and conclusion. Furthermore, the text of “BACKGROUND” in the abstract is completely copied and pasted in the first paragraph of the introduction.

### **Answering reviewer:**

Thank you for your comments. For the duplicated part, I apologize that this is an error caused by bad copy and paste. The uploaded attachment is the original document after polishing, in which the background part is different from the introduction. In addition, as for the format part, especially “CASE PRESENTATION”, I completely follow the format requirements of the journal and refer to the previous published articles for modification.