PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hepatology*

Manuscript NO: 65916

Title: Hepatocellular carcinoma in patients with metabolic dysfunction-associated fatty liver disease (MAFLD): can we stratify at-risk populations?

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02440884

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Chief Doctor, Full Professor, Professor, Senior Lecturer

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Germany

Author's Country/Territory: Argentina

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-18

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-18 19:01

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-24 07:30

Review time: 5 Days and 12 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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	[Y] Yes [ ] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In the review of Fassio and colleagues the important topic of metabolic dysfunction-associated fatty liver disease (MAFLD) in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma is addressed. The authors conclude the great challenge is stratifying the HCC risk in MAFLD patients without cirrhosis and reviewing the predictive value of data from genetic, demographic, metabolic and non-invasive fibrosis tests. The manuscript is well-written and in the scope of the Journal.   Comments 1.   The main problem of the study/ review is the nomenclature of MAFLD vs. NAFLD. In the Abstract the term NAFLD should be frequently given as: NAFLD/ MAFLD. 2.   Introduction: a   short paragraph should address the point that in previously studies NAFLD is under investigation, not MAFLD. The definitions are different. 3. Introduction: definition   of MAFLD is given including the statement 'evidence of liver steatosis'. This statement needs further explanation: percentage of lipid storage and the techniques to asses. 4.

Main part: the high number of data should be summarized in short tables/ schemes

5.   The relevant references are cited.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] 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) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The title reflect the main subject of the manuscript. The abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript. The figures, diagrams and tables are sufficient. The manuscript is well, concisely and coherently organized and presented. The manuscript needs only some language revision regarding the grammar and punctuation. Few comments are shown in the uploaded file.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hepatology*

Manuscript NO: 65916

Title: Hepatocellular carcinoma in patients with metabolic dysfunction-associated fatty liver disease (MAFLD): can we stratify at-risk populations?

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00070760

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Full Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Argentina

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-18

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-18 09:28

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-01 09:19

Review time: 13 Days and 23 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] 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	[Y] Yes [ ] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this review, authors updated the knowledge on epidemiological aspects of HCC in patients with MAFLD and analyzed which are the factors that increase the risk between patients with and without cirrhosis. To address this, authors answered the following questions: what is the incidence of HCC in MAFLD, with and without cirrhosis? What are the clinical risk factors of HCC in MAFLD? What are the genetic phenotypes associated with HCC in MAFLD? Which are the differences between HCC diagnosed in patients with MAFLD compared to other etiologies? How can we "best screen" HCC in MAFLD at 2021?   This review discusses clinical screening for MAFLD-associated HCC and provides some evidences and suggestions for clinical doctors and researchers. The authors need to further elaborate on risk factor stratification. The authors provided an overview of who is at risk of HCC, but does not answer how to stratify these risk population. Perhaps it is better to answer who is at high risk of HCC in terms of HR values but not answer in terms of OR or RR.