

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Hepatology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 23505

**Title:** non-Invasive Evaluation of Liver Fibrosis by ARFI and APRI in Chronic Hepatitis C

**Reviewer's code:** 00054275

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2015-11-26 16:08

**Date reviewed:** 2015-12-04 15:25

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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	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 two criticisms reported to the article by Li et al. are proper and correct. They appear valuable to examine in depth the topic of liver fibrosis evaluation.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Hepatology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 23505

**Title:** non-Invasive Evaluation of Liver Fibrosis by ARFI and APRI in Chronic Hepatitis C

**Reviewer's code:** 00052899

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2015-11-26 16:08

**Date reviewed:** 2015-12-09 20:44

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 checked="" 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 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"/> 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

In the letter to the editor, the authors carefully studied the article by Li et al and gave two criticisms from the perspective of methodology. First, the authors suggested that subcostal approach would give better results than intercostal approach in terms of determining the elasticity of the liver. Second, it is better to mention the length of the biopsy material and the number of the pieces of the portal tracts. The criticisms are reasonable and rigorous.