

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6856

Title: Non-invasive diagnosis of liver fibrosis

Reviewer code: 02547420

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2013-10-31 08:16

Date reviewed: 2013-11-19 00:30

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)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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

In this paper authors introduced a new non-aggressive prediction method for liver fibrosis. The However, the authors should prepare a revised version of the paper, taking into account the following points: 1. The liver biopsy is the gold standard for staging liver fibrosis. Could author provide some data that compared with the biopsy and serum biomarkers? Could you authors supply the relationship between the biopsy score and serum biomarkers? 2. To evaluate a prediction method, it is necessary to think out the economic factor. Could authors provide some economic data of the non-aggressive method, for example cost for detection.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6856

Title: Non-invasive diagnosis of liver fibrosis

Reviewer code: 00004936

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2013-10-31 08:16

Date reviewed: 2013-12-03 21:40

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	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors reviewed several invasive and non-invasive evaluation of liver fibrosis development in chronic hepatitis C (CHC) patients. They reviewed quite a lot of latest (published in 3 years) publications (about 40% among all references), and critically compared their advantages and disadvantages. The points of their arguments are compelling and worth publishing excluding several points listed below. Minor; 1, They are advised to clarify that they are dealing with HCV hepatitis patients in their title. 2, In Table.1, they discussed about running cost of each devices for liver fibrosis detection. The reviewer worries about their interpretation might make confusion. It seems very complicated which one costs higher. They are advised to make it clearer which way costs high in total. 3, They are advised to add abbreviation list in the main text. 4, Their English writing is quite polished, and the reviewer found no critical problems on their grammar.