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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The authors presented in their manuscript the genetic classification of hepatocellular adenoma. This classification is of practical importance for determining the risk of complications, in particular the risk of malignancy. The classification is a modern stratification of the risk of developing hepatocellular carcinoma. Classification is well related to morphology. The article needs to be used to determine the strategy for the treatment of hepatocellular adenoma. I recommend this manuscript for publication.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This is an interesting and comprehensive update on hepatocellular adenoma (HCA) focusing on genetic and underlying pathways that diver HCA pathogenesis. The manuscript could be considered for publication after adopting journal's requirements. I would reconsider the proposed type of the manuscript as it is not written as an editorial.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This is a well written review: 1 The Title reflects the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript. 2 The Abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript. 3 Key words reflect the focus of the manuscript. 4 The manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study. 5 The manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? 6 The research objectives are achieved by the experiments used in this study. The review is comprehensive and tutorial. 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper’s scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? 8 The figures, diagrams and tables are sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents. 9 References. Generally sufficient. I wonder HCA occurs in some of genetic metabolic disease, most famously glycogen disease type Ia (von Gierke). I wonder the authors could mention on how we should put this category in this classification beautifully stated here. The reference should be added. 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation is appropriate. 13. There are no problems in ethics.