ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology
ESPS manuscript NO: 16690
Title: 3.0 Tesla MRI: a new standard in liver imaging?
Reviewer's code: 02861055
Reviewer's country: Italy
Science editor: Yue-Li Tian
Date sent for review: 2015-01-28 18:21
Date reviewed: 2015-04-06 00:52

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The submitted manuscript by Girometti presents a detailed review about advantages and drawbacks of the use of 3.0 tesla compared to conventional 1.5 tesla magnets. The Author presents the limitations of 3.0 tesla magnets, discusses possible technical solutions and describes its current strong points. The manuscript is interesting and well structured. A few minor comments are listed below.   - At the beginning of the manuscript, the Author states "MRI is recommended, when available, as the imaging modality of choice for the detection and characterization of focal liver lesions" citing the recent guideline by Marrero et al. This assumption seems only partially correct. In fact, despite minor differences in the performances of TC and MRI in detecting different focal liver lesions (except that in the hydatid cyst), the guideline underlines the importance of a "technically appropriate" TC or MRI rather than suggesting preferential imaging modalities.   The Author should reformulate his sentence or add data to support it.   - The second of the three technical challenges appears difficult to understand for a general reader. The Author should try to explain what are the consequences of the increase in "the radiofrequency (RF) deposition to the patient".   - In the manuscript a number of abbreviations are not opened (e.g. SAR, NSF). The Author should open the abbreviation at their first

use. Moreover, a list of abbreviation would facilitate the reader.   - The paper should be revised for occasional typing errors (e.g. "sever" rather than "severe", "must undoubtedly better" rather than "must undoubtedly be better", etc.)

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology
ESPS manuscript NO: 16690
Title: 3.0 Tesla MRI: a new standard in liver imaging?
Reviewer's code: 02861217
Reviewer's country: United States
Science editor: Yue-Li Tian
Date sent for review: 2015-01-28 18:21
Date reviewed: 2015-04-09 17:57

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Dr. Rossano Girometti, Your manuscript touch on controversial part of imaging access in Hepatology. The manuscript is very interesting, but due to technical terms it could be difficult to understand for WJH general subscribers. No doubt it could be published in World Journal of Hepatology. Nevertheless, there are some mechanical mistakes in the text (mentioned with red) and some abbreviations are not opened. In conclusion very worthy will be your personal summarizing and recommendation about of 3.0T advantage in particular diagnosis.