PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 77894

Title: Hepatic steatosis with mass effect: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 03258338

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Italy

Author’s Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-05-27

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-25 10:53

Reviewer performed review: 2022-07-08 17:05

Review time: 13 Days and 6 Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific quality</th>
<th>Grade A: Excellent</th>
<th>Grade B: Very good</th>
<th>Grade C: Good</th>
<th>Grade D: Fair</th>
<th>Grade E: Do not publish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language quality</td>
<td>Grade A: Priority publishing</td>
<td>Grade B: Minor language polishing</td>
<td>Grade C: A great deal of language polishing</td>
<td>Grade D: Rejection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Accept (High priority)</td>
<td>Accept (General priority)</td>
<td>Minor revision</td>
<td>Major revision</td>
<td>Rejection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-review</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-reviewer: Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous
SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Thank you for the opportunity to review this article. In this work, the authors present a case of hepatic steatosis presentig with mass effect. Authors suggest that RMN is valuable for differential diagnosis with fat-rich tumors. The paper is well written and contains a topic that is very frequently addressed in ultrasound practice. Major comments and revision: 1. Authors say in background that "there is no report of hepatic steatosis with mass effect in literaturee". later, in discussion, they claim that "it is extremely rare". So: is it rare or does it not exist? In the second case, it is correct to explain and report more deeply other reports. 2. In a work in which hepatic steatosis is discussed, it is not possible not to refer to the ultrasound method in the specific case and with respect to the conclusions. 3. Re-order discussion, addressing first of all the crucial point of the work and the report, then going back to the pathophysiology of steatosis (But more synthetically) and finally reporting well the similar cases (if any) and strengths and weaknesses of the different methods.
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Title: Hepatic steatosis with mass effect: a case report  Na Hu, Shijun Su, Jinye Li, et al.

General Comments
The authors reported a case with a liver tumor over 10 cm without background chronic liver diseases. Based on the characteristic features that were observed in MRI images and immunohistochemical studies, hepatic steatosis was diagnosed. Although the authors raised the T1-weighted in-and out-of-phase images as the most valuable information to make differential diagnosis, there are other valuable information which should be presented and discussed for the better understanding and management of a future case with liver tumors. The followings are several concerns that the authors may wish to consider:

1) Specific comments
   Major concerns: 1. Hemodynamics and results of immunohistochemistry should be helpful information. Please present images in a dynamic study using contrast medium and discuss the results of immunohistochemistry to make differential diagnosis. In addition, it is crucial to discuss thoughtfully if a surgical resection had to be made in this case and would be recommended in a case with liver tumors showing similar characteristics with this case.
   Minor concerns: 1. Laboratory findings should be presented by showing actual values.
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Thanks to Authors and Editors. After these revisions, I think that manuscript can be accepted for publication. Best regards, PG