



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hepatology*

Manuscript NO: 91259

Title: Update in lean metabolic dysfunction-associated steatotic liver disease

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 05431771

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Academic Editor, Assistant Professor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Egypt

Author’s Country/Territory: Peru

Manuscript submission date: 2023-12-26

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-12-26 05:06

Reviewer performed review: 2024-01-02 22:58

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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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
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

The topic is of high clinical importance and you've performed an outstanding review. However, few remarks could improve the overall quality of your paper. 1- Please add more on the recent updates concerning MASLD pathophysiology as promised in the abstract 2- Please add more information/clarification to interpret why MASLD is a better clinical tool than the previous nomenclature 3- Please mention your search in Google Scholar in the abstract instead of "selected papers published in English" 4- Could you offer an explanation to some of the contradictory results e.g. regarding NAS or could you better describe the limitations found in some of them? 5- Please move the paragraph starting with "Various pharmacological treatments and interventions" upwards to end the section "Pharmacological" instead of its current place ending the one "Non-pharmacological" and adopt "we intended" instead of "we intend" 6- Please add the potential reason why lean MASLD had a higher mortality rate in the UNOS cited 7- Please stick to the journal guidelines e.g. a Core tip is needed and use "References" not "Citations"