

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hepatology*

Manuscript NO: 75150

Title: Liver EOB-MRI for evaluation of response to treatment after SBRT of HCC

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05127202

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2022-04-07

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-04-07 08:37

Reviewer performed review: 2022-04-08 08:53

Review time: 1 Day

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The study results show that the efficacy of SBRT should be evaluated not in the first 6 months, but at least 9 months post-SBRT, when infield progression persists at very low rates while the risk of outfield progression increases significantly. There are the following problems that need to be corrected. 1. Many single sentences are a natural paragraph, and the writing format is not standardized. 2. Some points in the background section lack citations. 3. Table 1 is not necessary. 4. Table 2 does not use a three-wire table. 5. There are too many pictures and need to be merged. 6. The references are too old, and it is recommended to mainly cite the literature published in the past 5 years. 7.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hepatology*

Manuscript NO: 75150

Title: Liver EOB-MRI for evaluation of response to treatment after SBRT of HCC

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05562744

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FACS, MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor, Senior Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2022-04-07

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-01 21:24

Reviewer performed review: 2022-05-03 10:09

Review time: 1 Day and 12 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1 Title. Reflects the content of the study. 2 Abstract. Abstract summarizes the content and goal of the treatment 3 Key words. eywords reflect the content of the treatment 4 Background. Introduction section is well-written. There are many spelling errors and revision of the English language is very important 5 Methods. The methods section is poorly organized. Subsections are required. Since some of the patients received a bridge to liver transplantation, it would be very good for authors to provide the explant pathological analysis of the six patients that were transplanted 6 Results. The results are well written. The most striking data is the need for observing for 6 months before observing any effects of SBRT which is also valid for TARE as well. 7 Discussion. Well written and the references are up to date 8 Illustrations and tables. well presented 9 Biostatistics. Biostatistical analysis certificate is presented 10 Units. All units are presented in SI units. 11 References. References are up to date 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Generally the quality of the manuscript is poor due to language and organizational problems. 13 Research methods and reporting. Not applicable because retrospective design 14 Ethics statements. is provided

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hepatology*

Manuscript NO: 75150

Title: Liver EOB-MRI for evaluation of response to treatment after SBRT of HCC

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05562744

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FACS, MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor, Senior Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2022-04-07

Reviewer chosen by: Li-Li Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-28 18:15

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-28 18:20

Review time: 1 Hour

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" 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

I would like to thank the authors for they have excelled in the revisions.