

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 61090

Title: Awareness of NASH and treatment guidelines: What are physicians telling us?

Reviewer's code: 03742189
Position: Peer Reviewer
Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: South Korea

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2020-11-23

Reviewer chosen by: Lian-Sheng Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-11-24 01:37

Reviewer performed review: 2020-11-27 08:55

Review time: 3 Days and 7 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



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

- Your manuscript described well about the current knowledge status about NAFLD and NASH and discrepancy amongst gastroenterologists, endocrinologists, and primary physicians. - The title, aim, conclusion, and key words include "treatment", however, contents about treatment are very limited. your work only focused the unwareness of diagnostic approach tools about NAFLD and NASH. So, you may consider to omit the word of "treatment" in your manuscript. Key words "treatment" can be replaced by "Diagnosis". - Your future work is anticipated for the practical advertisement for the knowledge of NAFLD/NASH to physicians.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 61090

Title: Awareness of NASH and treatment guidelines: What are physicians telling us?

Reviewer's code: 00004364 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2020-11-23

Reviewer chosen by: Lian-Sheng Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-11-26 00:27

Reviewer performed review: 2020-11-27 09:17

Review time: 1 Day and 8 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



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

In this paper, they investigated whether the primary care and endocrine doctors who first examine patients have the knowledge of treatment guidelines for NASH and NAFLD, and they are able to accurately respond to patient examination methods. It is expected that primary care and endocrinologists will have less knowledge of non-invasive analysis methods (FIB4, Fibrocan, etc.) than gastroenterologists, and the claim that enlightenment of such knowledge is considered important was reasonable. On the other hand, I am afraid that various biases may occur because the number of target doctors is very small in the wide area of the United States. 1. The age of the investigated Doctor may also affect as a parameter. Is it possible that there is a difference in knowledge about NASH etc. depending on when you received basic education? 2. The district of doctors was involved in the knowledge of NASH and NAFLD? The knowledge of metabolic syndrome may change depending on the environment in which the patient is being examined, because the number of cases varies depending on race and lifestyle.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 61090

Title: Awareness of NASH and treatment guidelines: What are physicians telling us?

Reviewer's code: 05045866 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Croatia

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2020-11-23

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-11-25 22:25

Reviewer performed review: 2020-11-29 11:30

Review time: 3 Days and 13 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



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

This is a nice paper examining the extent of knowledge and practice regarding NASH diagnosis and management guidelines including a cohort of 185 primary care physicians, gastroenterology, and endocrinology specialists. There are only minor corrections needed to improve the manuscript. Otherwise the article is clear and appropriate. The methodology doesn't need any edits. The results, the discussion and conclusion sections are adequately and appropriately presented. The statistical methods are clearly presented and the tables and figures are easily readable and appropriate. The organization of the article follows the standard recommendations of an original article and English language is acceptable. 1. I think that term NASH should be replaced with MASH (metabolically associated steatohepatitis) since this terminology was conceived in order to raise awareness of steatohepatitis in metabolic disturbances and that is the main issue here. Considering the fact that it was recently recommended to replace the term NAFLD with the more appropriate term MAFLD (metabolic associated fatty liver disease), a suggestion for authors is also to follow these recommendations and replace the terms NAFLD and NASH with MAFLD and MASH wherever they appear in the manuscript. (What's in a name? Renaming 'NAFLD' to 'MAFLD'; Yasser Fouad Imam Waked Steven Bollipo Ahmed Gomaa Yousef Ajlouni Dina Attia. From NAFLD to MAFLD: when pathophysiology succeeds; Herbert Tilg & Maria Effenberger). 2. In the Abstract, please state that the cohort included 185 participants out of 12,869 physicians drawn from a national physician database 3. The result section should simply state the findings of this study, so the interpretation and discussion parts should be transferred to the discussion section.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 61090

Title: Awareness of NASH and treatment guidelines: What are physicians telling us?

Reviewer's code: 00004364 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2020-11-23

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ru Fan

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-12-21 03:21

Reviewer performed review: 2020-12-21 10:26

Review time: 7 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors responded the reviewer' comments.