

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Radiology*

Manuscript NO: 82425

Title: Hepatocellular Carcinoma: State of the Art Diagnostic Imaging

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05752753

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-18

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-09 07:25

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-12 06:55

Review time: 2 Days and 23 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input 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 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
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Congratulations to the authors for well written review

1. Diagnosis of HCC at an early stage has a favorable impact on outcome.
2. Many previously published articles have suggested that the screening for HCC in patients with cirrhosis is awfully inadequate even in developed countries. The reasons are multifactorial but the major being lack of co-ordination between clinicians and radiology scheduling.
3. In developing countries and underdeveloped world cost, availability of radiology services and trained radiologists adds to dismal rates of HCC screening/detection. How can this be improved ? The authors can share their thoughts about this pertinent issue.
4. Though the review is about the state of art diagnostic imaging I request the authors to kindly propose a flowchart/ algorithm for HCC screening that could be universally feasible and acceptable.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Radiology*

Manuscript NO: 82425

Title: Hepatocellular Carcinoma: State of the Art Diagnostic Imaging

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05267231

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Chief Physician

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Greece

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-18

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-08 04:32

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-21 05:43

Review time: 13 Days and 1 Hour

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

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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

I want to congratulate all authors for this outstanding paper. It was a privilege to read it.

The English language is perfect. The abstract and the whole structure are well-designed.

Although there is no table with summarized data (these tables are somewhat “necessary” in review-type articles), the text is very well organized and exciting to read. All sections have sufficient and clear presenting data. Minor 1. In Contrast-Enhanced Ultrasound section; (such as SonoVue®, Definity®, SonoVue®). Sonovue seems to be twice. 2. In the same section; “...the CEUS-LIRADS was released....” It should be “CEUS LI-RADS” 3. I can not find any “figure X” in the T1 mapping section.