

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hepatology*

Manuscript NO: 64962

Title: Imaging evaluation of the liver in oncology patients: a comparison of techniques

Reviewer's code: 05128663

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: BSc, MD, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Academic Research, Attending Doctor, Postdoc, Research Associate, Research Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Greece

Author's Country/Territory: Portugal

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-17 14:23

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-24 09:53

Review time: 6 Days and 19 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 Grade E: Do not publish
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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Comments to the authors The article with the title “Imaging evaluation of the liver in oncology patients: a comparison of techniques” is in generally well done, but I would offer these comments to the investigators: 1) There are some minor language errors. 2)

There are some minor grammatical errors. 3) Liver-specific contrast agents for the evaluation of liver parenchymal lesion are recommended to be more extensively presented. 4) Newer references should be used. 5) The modes of US (2d/3d/4d) should be referred and compared to each other.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hepatology*

Manuscript NO: 64962

Title: Imaging evaluation of the liver in oncology patients: a comparison of techniques

Reviewer's code: 05742869

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Research Scientist, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Kazakhstan

Author's Country/Territory: Portugal

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-15 03:46

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-26 02:56

Review time: 10 Days and 23 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" 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

Review article titled “Imaging evaluation of the liver in oncology patients: a comparison of techniques” In this review, authors indicated that this study aimed to briefly review each of the imaging techniques and subsequently compare them in assessing liver metastases, including detection, characterization, diagnosis, and treatment response evaluation. However, for me isn’t clear that how authors selected articles that were included in this review. What criteria of inclusion and exclusion were followed by authors to collect articles to make a comparison? Since the study is comparative, I recommend that authors should follow the Prisma recommendation (for example <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1245/s10434-020-09365-x>). Hence, it’s important in the manuscript text (in the methods section) to provide information regarding article searching strategies, searching years, MeSH keywords, and databases that were used. Also, there are many figures in this review, and I think authors should reassess the necessity of adding all these figures. As for me instead of adding a lot of figures inclusion a table that can demonstrate an analysis of articles with different imaging techniques will be more informative.