



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: editorialoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Hepatology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 10769

**Title:** Evaluation of hepatic blood flow by contrast-enhanced ultrasound (CEUS) and of fibrosis by Fibroscan in patients with NAFLD and NASH

**Reviewer code:** 00006592

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2014-04-18 16:05

**Date reviewed:** 2014-04-23 02:36

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This work addressed the evaluation of liver vascular changes and fibrosis by CEUS and Fibroscan techniques in controls and NAFLD/NASH patients. The following comments should be addressed by the author:

1. The manuscript should be corrected for some mistakes and english language improvement.
2. Abbreviations that need definition in the Introduction: VLDL in page 1 and PV in page 2.
3. In the Results section, data presented in Table 2 is duplicated in Figure 1, those in Table 3 is repeated in Figure 2, and MTT data in Tables 2 and 3 are duplicated in Figure 3, which is unacceptable. Thus, Tables 2 and 3 should be eliminated.
4. LV in the first paragraph-line 2 of the Discussion should be corrected (LP).
5. References: The style of the names of the cited journals differs among them, which must be changed to the same format.



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: editorialoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Hepatology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 10769

**Title:** Evaluation of hepatic blood flow by contrast-enhanced ultrasound (CEUS) and of fibrosis by Fibroscan in patients with NAFLD and NASH

**Reviewer code:** 00053727

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2014-04-18 16:05

**Date reviewed:** 2014-04-23 14:58

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors evaluated the feasibility of assessing liver vascular changes and fibrosis, respectively, using CEUS and Fibroscan in patients with NAFLD and NASH. This is an interesting diagnosing aspects for NAFLD/NASH .However I have the following concerns. 1. The study population is very less. 2. The authors have used the untargeted CEUS for this study .Targeted CEUS can much explain the inflammatory cells involved as inflammatory is one of the cause of NAFLD . 3. Representative CUES figures will add much reference to this manuscript. 4. Tables and figures mentioned in the MS (graph) is merely repetition. 5. Disadvantages using these CUES may be discussed. The authors should discuss about the following guidelines The EFSUMB Guidelines and Recommendations on the Clinical Practice of Contrast Enhanced Ultrasound (CEUS): Update 2011 on non-hepatic applications *Ultraschall in Med* 2012; 33(1): 33-59 DOI: 10.1055/s-0031-1281676



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: editorialoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Hepatology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 10769

**Title:** Evaluation of hepatic blood flow by contrast-enhanced ultrasound (CEUS) and of fibrosis by Fibroscan in patients with NAFLD and NASH

**Reviewer code:** 00053451

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2014-04-18 16:05

**Date reviewed:** 2014-04-29 11:37

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

**Summary** This is a clinical study which evaluated the findings of contrast-enhanced US and Fibroscan in patients with NAFLD and control. The authors found some differences of the hepatic hemodynamics and liver stiffness among control NAFL and NASH. **General comments** Although the topic may be of interest, this paper is poorly organized as a scientific paper. The study while worthy is unlikely to be of much interest to most of the readership of WJG. I suggest they revise this paper and consider submission to another journal, after drastic copyediting. **Specific comments**

**Title** OK **Abstract** Please specify the design of the study, prospective or retrospective. **Introduction** This section is quite lengthy and redundant. It should be shortened by at least 50%. "Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) is the most common cause of chronic liver disease." This is NOT correct. The leading cause is viral infection at present. The aim of the study is NOT clearly described. **Methods** There are not clear diagnostic criteria of NAFLD and NASH, which is one of the serious limitations of the study. Method for image analysis of contrast-enhanced US is complicated. Please explain more clearly using some figures. **Results** I recommend the authors compare the contrast data with Doppler blood flow data. The data about intra-, inter-observer variability for contrast parameters are needed. **Discussion** Liver stiffness data in this study in NASH is much lower than the data in the previous study, such as HEPATOLOGY 2010;51:454-462. Are there any specific criteria or bias for patient enrollment? Please discuss the issue. Anyhow, it is hard to draw the conclusion with the data in the current paper. **Reference** OK **Figures** Please add figures for the explanation of contrast parameter measurement.