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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
My Comments and Suggestions to Authors: 1- The abstract is not convincing and is disorganized, it should be refined to precisely illustrate what authors have done in this paper within 200 words. 2- This application topic has not received much attention in the literature. However, the study, literature review and presentation require substantial improvement in several respects. 3- Result and Discussion section is inadequate. Need more attention and better explanation. 4- Through my review of this manuscript, I did not notice the main contributions and there is no literature review. Please including a section for literature review to enhance the background knowledge of readers about existing schemes. Moreover, there are no Tables 1 and 2. Authors should review their manuscript well and re-check it. 5- There are many repetitions in sentences. 6- The conclusions in this manuscript are good. 7- References aren’t formatted according to rules.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Title: Congenital hepatic cyst: A case series and literature review. Chunxia Du, Changgui Lu, Wei Li, Weibing Tang. 1) General Comments In this manuscript, the authors narratively presented own experience of eleven cases with perinatally-detected liver cysts and briefly reviewed the literature. Although the information is precious because of rare cases, the authors should select an appropriate journal style. If the authors focused on their own cases, narrative presentation should be made as a case report. Otherwise, the authors should complete through reviewing of the literature with their own cases.
RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 77019

Title: Congenital hepatic cyst: A case series

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 06090125

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Lecturer, Technical Editor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Iraq

Author’s Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-04-11

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-29 05:27

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-29 07:03

Review time: 1 Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific quality</th>
<th>[ ] Grade A: Excellent</th>
<th>[ Y] Grade B: Very good</th>
<th>[ ] Grade C: Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] Grade D: Fair</td>
<td>[ ] Grade E: Do not publish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language quality</th>
<th>[ Y] Grade A: Priority publishing</th>
<th>[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing</td>
<td>[ ] Grade D: Rejection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>[ ] Accept (High priority)</th>
<th>[ Y] Accept (General priority)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] Minor revision</td>
<td>[ ] Major revision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Peer-reviewer      | Peer-Review: [ Y] Anonymous | [ ] Onymous                   |
| statements         |                           |                             |
|                    | Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes | [ Y] No                   |
SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The authors properly answered all of the reviewer comments. I suggest to accept this manuscript.
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In this revision, the authors change the journal from World Journal of Gastroenterology to World Journal of Clinical Cases along with my suggestion. Unfortunately, however, the format of manuscript, especially “CASE PRESENTATION”, is quite poor. They are almost tables rather than a text presentation. It is an effective way to summarize the data in tables, but cases must be described in text as connecting with the discussion and conclusion. Furthermore, the text of “BACKGROUND” in the abstract is completely copied and pasted in the first paragraph of the introduction. It should not be.