

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15053

**Title:** 3.0T 1H MR Spectroscopy in Assessment of steatosis in Chronic Hepatitis C

**Reviewer's code:** 00503561

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2014-11-08 20:34

**Date reviewed:** 2014-11-20 15:23

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] The same title	<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"/> [ ] Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The review is informative and useful. Importance of introducing this non-invasive technique into the practice is impressive. Please add one paragraph to describe compare the findings on HCV related disease (here in this manuscript) to those of other liver disease.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15053

**Title:** 3.0T 1H MR Spectroscopy in Assessment of steatosis in Chronic Hepatitis C

**Reviewer's code:** 00189256

**Reviewer's country:** Ukraine

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2014-11-08 20:34

**Date reviewed:** 2014-11-22 23:38

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

You have prepared an article devoted to the urgent problem of clinical medicine. The material is presented logically and correctly. Selected methods are adequate to the research problems and the aim.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15053

**Title:** 3.0T 1H MR Spectroscopy in Assessment of steatosis in Chronic Hepatitis C

**Reviewer's code:** 00926880

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2014-11-08 20:34

**Date reviewed:** 2014-11-10 19:01

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a study on "45 patients with chronic hepatitis C (HCV) and 15 healthy volunteers (the control group)". The study aimed to investigate the use of 1H Magnetic Resonance Imaging Spectroscopy as a noninvasive test of steatosis on these subjects. I have the following comments: (1) The English of this paper is poor and it is difficult to read. The paper is full of grammatical and typographical errors; (2) The Abstract contains no data; (3) The authors divided their patients into groups which are clumsily worded "severe fatty liver fatty liver group and a group with mild to moderate fatty liver fatty liver group, moderate and severe fatty liver fatty liver group"; (4) All terms should be defined on first use, e.g. 1HMRS, NMR, HCV RNA; (5) There are terms which have no meaning to me, e.g. "Fhistological assessment"; (6) I do not understand how many patients were used in this study. The authors stated "From January 2010 to June 2010, 120 patients with chronic hepatitis C were enrolled. The diagnosis of HCV patients was based on ..... A total of 45 HCV patients and 15 healthy volunteers as a control group meeting the inclusion criteria were enrolled". How many were the total number of patients in this study, 120? 60? 45? Table 1 showed only 45 patients in this study (15+13+8+9=45); (7) Was needle biopsy of the liver used as the gold standard of comparison with 1H

MRS? If yes, please clearly state this in the paper. How did the authors overcome the problems of small sample biopsy size and inter-observer variability as stated in the Introduction when needle biopsy was used as the gold standard? (8) I became even more confused when I came to Results of this study. Under Demographics and baseline characteristics, the authors stated "This group of patients with mild fatty liver is 13 (28.89%), 8 cases of moderate fatty liver (17.78%), 9 cases of severe fatty liver (20.0%), 15 cases without fatty liver (33.33%)." It seems that there were 45 patients. However, for the 15 patients without fatty liver, were they HCV +ve or were they volunteer healthy subject? (9) It became even more confusing as I read on. Under 1H-MRS spectrum characteristics, the authors stated "1 case due to can't breathing, 1h MRS is not successful ....." In this study, were there 44 or 45 patients in total? (10) Please standardize the term 1H-MRS. The authors sometimes wrong 1H-MRS, sometimes 1h-MRS and sometimes 'H-MRS.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15053

**Title:** 3.0T 1H MR Spectroscopy in Assessment of steatosis in Chronic Hepatitis C

**Reviewer's code:** 01562153

**Reviewer's country:** Taiwan

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2014-11-08 20:34

**Date reviewed:** 2014-11-10 23:02

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this manuscript, the authors investigated the utility of 1H magnetic resonance imaging spectroscopy (MRS) as a noninvasive test of steatosis in patients with chronic hepatitis C. They found that the difference between the different levels of pathology analysis of variance showed differences of fat peak, the area under fat peak, ratio of the fat peak to the water peak and ratio of the area under fat peak to the area under water peak were statistically significant, and that each index value correspondingly increase with the increase of the severity of fatty liver. The authors concluded that the 1H MRS can be used as an indicator of steatosis in chronic hepatitis C patients. The originality of this manuscript was not high. The results just confirmed the utility of 1H MRS as a noninvasive test of steatosis. The patient number was also small. However, this study could offer some useful information to the clinicians.