

Format for ANSWERING REVIEWERS



April 14, 2015

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: 16467-review.doc).

Title: ~~Benign Focal Liver Lesions in Pediatric Patients — A Review with Emphasis on Imaging Features~~
Benign Liver Tumors in Pediatric Patients – Review with Emphasis on Imaging Features (*We have changed the title according to reviewer's advice.*)

Author: Liliana Chiorean, Xin-Wu Cui, Andrea Tannapfel, Doris Franke, Martin Stenzel, Wojciech Kosiak, Dagmar Schreiber-Dietrich, Jörg Jüngert, Jian-Min Chang, Christoph F. Dietrich

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 16467

The manuscript has been improved according to the suggestions of reviewers:

1. Format has been updated
2. Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewer

Reviewer No. 2908500

General comments:

This paper has an interesting subject and it is a huge work.

[Reply: Thank you very much.](#)

Specific comments:

1. There are no images of these types of lesions. Perhaps it will be more instructive if the authors will add some figures.

[Reply: We added three figures.](#)

2. Please provide a brief title for each figure on a separate page (e.g. Figure 1). This figure must be modified (no need to put the reference on the figure).

[Reply: We have removed Figure 1 from within the manuscript.](#)

3. There are some minor language polishing required, for example: Pag 33 in conclusion: `` patients is an possible option...`` Pag 5: ``... US accurately excludes a mass.... Pag 12: ... hemangiomas and differenziate....

Reply: We have corrected the language errors.

4. The first author must be written with bold in the references.

Reply: We used the WJG reference style in Endnote, we do not know why the first author was not bold in the reference. So, we manually corrected the references.

Reviewer No. 2544637

This is an interesting paper. There are comments given below:

1. There are many language mistakes, like “ hemangioendothelioma、 mesenchymalhamartoma、 cardiac or、 [13, , 79,80] “. Please modify this paper.

Reply: We have corrected the language mistakes.

2. In the paper, description of the most FLLs included “introduction、 Imaging features、 Treatment and prognosis” . But in HA, there is a paragraph specially describe complications, and the only figure of the paper also given in this part. These make that part stand out in the paper.

Reply: We have merged the ‘Complication’ subchapter with the previous one, under the name of ‘Treatment, prognosis and potential complications’.

3. The table is huge and without footnote.

Reply: We have split the table into 5 smaller tables, each describing the imaging features of each discussed FLL, including also footnotes.

Reviewer No. 227616

Review of “Benign Focal Liver Lesions in Pediatric patients- A systematic review with emphasis on imaging features” for possible publication in World Journal of Gastroenterology. Comments: In this review article, the authors describe the primary benign hepatic tumors in pediatric patients and their imaging appearances. It is an interesting review article and here are my comments.

General comments

1. The manuscript has several grammatical errors and spelling mistakes. The manuscript needs revision preferably by an author with English as native language to address these errors.

Reply: We have corrected the language errors.

2. The article is too long and reads like a book chapter. I would recommend that the authors make the article more concise by cutting down redundant sections and excluding nonrelevant topics.

Reply: The invited unrestricted article summarizes the literature. The authors believe to deliver a concise article with many modifications, see above and below. Please indicate additional sentences and paragraphs which should be deleted and we are willing to consider and to do so.

Specific Comments

I. Title

3. The title states that the article is about benign focal liver lesions while the abstract and manuscript describe primary hepatic tumors. Since liver lesions could include infective and non-tumorous conditions such as abscess, cyst etc, I would recommend the authors to modify the title accordingly.

Reply: We have changed the title from 'Benign Focal Liver Lesions in Pediatric Patients – A Review with Emphasis on Imaging Features' to 'Benign Liver Tumors in Pediatric Patients – Review with Emphasis on Imaging Features.

II. Abstract.

4. The abstract is vague and talks generally about primary hepatic tumors in pediatric population. I would recommend the authors to modify the abstract to include specific details about incidence and types of pediatric hepatic tumors. In addition while describing the imaging appearances, the authors should try to specify if imaging helps in pretreatment evaluation, follow up or post surgical/ treatment evaluation. A brief description here regarding the role of advanced imaging tests such as MR, PET MR and contrast enhanced ultrasound in management of these patients is essential.

Reply: We have modified the abstract highlighting the types of benign liver tumors discussed in our paper as well as the role of imaging for diagnosis, pre-treatment evaluation and follow-up. We have specified the importance of advanced imaging tests for focal liver lesions assessment and following description of enhancement patterns for each lesion discussed. Specific details about incidence of each type of discussed lesion have already been given in each corresponding subchapter and in introduction as well.

III. Main Text

5. The introduction is too long. I would recommend that the authors make it concise.

Reply: We have reduced the introduction and categorized the different imaging modalities for pediatric liver tumors evaluation as a different section.

6. The section in the introduction discussing the different imaging modalities in pediatric tumor evaluation can be categorized as a different section.

Reply: Done.

7. Page 5. Statement “although contrast-enhanced ultrasound has higher still off label use in children”. Please provide numbers for comparison of diagnostic efficacy of CEUS vs baseline regular US in focal liver lesions

Reply: We have stated that data comparing the diagnostic efficacy of CEUS vs. baseline US are not available in pediatric age group.

8. Page 5. Line “Some MR and CT contrast media....” Please elaborate and specify on the contrast media – type and concentration which are off label use in children.

Reply: We referred to the literature.

9. Page 5. Please provide numbers for the complication rate of liver biopsy in children

Reply: We provided numbers for the complication rate of liver biopsy in children.

10. Please provide more general details on the role of CT and MR in focal liver lesion categorization in children. For example, the value of each phase and type of MR contrast media used etc.

Reply: We did not provide here, in introduction, more detailed information regarded the role of CT/MRI (such as value of each vascular phase) because these have been explained in details in corresponding subchapters when discussing the imaging features of the respective FLL.

11. The section on CEUS is too long and several portions are not relevant to the topic under discussion. Please consider significantly shortening this portion. Though the authors would like to discuss the controversies regarding CEUS, in this review article focusing on focal liver lesions, it is best to describe the role of CEUS vis-à-vis focal hepatic lesions.

Reply: The invited unrestricted article summarizes the literature. The authors believe to deliver a concise article with many modifications, see above and below. Please indicate additional sentences and paragraphs which should be deleted and we are willing to consider and to do so.

IV. Table

12. The Table 1 needs revision. It is too wordy and has too much information. The contents of the table need to be made brief.

Reply: We have revised and reduced the content of the Table 1 and split it into five sections, one for each described FLL.

V. References

13. OK

VI. Figures

13. I did not see any figures in the manuscript. For a review article discussing imaging findings, inclusion of figures is mandatory and without figures, the manuscript has little educational value.

Reply: We included four figures.

Reviewer No. 2988812:

I congratulate the authors for the very well written and comprehensive review on benign focal liver lesions. The English language is polished and the content is very well laid out on the paper with a specific attention dedicated to imaging modalities. It might be helpful to add some comments on complimentary diagnostic techniques, such as FDG-PET scan, but overall it is a very good paper.

Reply: Other diagnostic techniques will be described in an additional paper by the authors and is, therefore, not part of this paper. References and typesetting were corrected

Thank you again for considering publication of our manuscript in the *World Journal of Gastroenterology*.

Sincerely yours,



Christoph F. Dietrich, Professor of Medicine
Sino-German research center of ultrasound in medicine
The first affiliated hospital of Zhengzhou University
Jianshe east road 1, Zhengzhou
450052 China
Tel: +86 (0)37166913150
Fax: +86 (0)37166913150
Email: christoph.dietrich@ckbm.de