

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 20793

Title: Challenges of liver cancer: Future emerging tools in imaging and urinary biomarkers

Reviewer's code: 02914462

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-06-22 15:55

Date reviewed: 2015-08-06 05:48

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article by Trovato et al. describes and provides an overview of clinical methods to detect liver cancer, and other advanced forms of liver disease. The authors give strong considerations to biomarkers of advance liver disease, which are alternatives to the fading gold-standard liver biopsy. The authors did a nice job of separating indirect and direct serum markers, and of describing other methods. I think the paper would be enhanced with the following suggestions: 1)A purpose statement is missing in both the abstract and introduction. Without a purpose statement, the reader has to assume the authors' purpose for the paper. 2)The introduction would benefit from more concise writing. A substantial portion of the introduction veers off from, what I believe is the authors' purpose of the paper, and then comes back around to perhaps why this paper is being written towards the ending of the introduction. Much of the introduction can be trimmed. 3)The last sentence of the 3rd paragraph under the transient elastography section which reads, "Further studies have demonstrated compelling correlation between liver stiffness . . ." needs to be cited. Please cite those studies. 4)All of the Leonardo da Vinci, Coco Chanel, William Shakespeare quotes (under



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

specific headings) should be removed. 5)In the title, "SUSTAINABLE AND RELIABLE DIAGNOSIS. THE PLACE OF URINARY BIOMARKERS FO LIVER CANCER DIAGNOSIS" the "FO" should be corrected. 6)The Marie Curie quote in the conclusion can be removed. The quote seems to not flow well with the paragraph. The discussion about countries with limited resources is well taken in the conclusion. However, the point is not made in a supportive context. Perhaps, situate the point in a more developed context, or abandon the point and provide a summary to the reader of the clinical relevance and clinical implications of this shift that is or needs to occur towards other technological methods of detecting advanced liver disease.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 20793

Title: Challenges of liver cancer: Future emerging tools in imaging and urinary biomarkers

Reviewer's code: 00068720

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-06-22 15:55

Date reviewed: 2015-07-03 12:47

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors discuss a variety of non-invasive assessment techniques of liver disease. The paper is written in a good English, and it's a very interesting topic. However, there are still some works, which are worth being discussed. 1. In ABSTRACT and CONCLUSION part, it is to be suggested that author should clearly indicated the study conclusion, and to be mentioned how the study is useful for the practical purposes. 2. Table 2 could add some details, such as disease, the clinical significance or value etc. In figure 5 and figure 6, the legend should be more detailed also. 3. Please check the spelling and format, such as REFERENCES 17,19,20,23,24,26,44, 50, 53.