

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Hepatology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRHE_99398
Title of the Manuscript:	Epithelioid hemangioendothelioma of the liver: a case report
Type of the Article	Case study

### **General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajrrhe.com/index.php/AJRRHE/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes. A rare condition however lack of novelty in the management or clinical context. This is acceptable. I think the author should touch up a different angle of case report to state the importance, rarity and even attempted management of the condition in the literature.</b></p> <p><b>Acceptable</b></p> <p><b>Acceptable</b></p> <p><b>Appropriate</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>Sufficient but inconsistent. This should be according to the journal requirement</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Acceptable	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>I believe</p> <p>a) In the introduction, additional information of how many case-report have been done for similar condition and if available estimated prevalence/ incidence.</p> <p>b) Additional information to highlight the importance of this context of hemangioendothelioma. Perhaps pathophysiology, postulation, diagnostic approach, trials or management</p> <p>c) CD31 and CD 34 – Are these diagnostic markers? This needs to be highlighted on how the conclusion is made from immunohistochemistry. Is there any other differential from these 2 markers positivity? What are typical or differences to conclude as hemangioendothelioma?</p> <p>d) Additional of collection of management in literatures if available to add novelty to the paper and their success. Or are there any work to study on biomarker for this condition.</p> <p>e) I think the figures are too many. I think this should be selected to 1-2 figures only. Similar to imaging, may be 2 significant imaging ie primary and metastasis</p> <p>f) Please check consistency of the reference, there is a need for amendment</p>	

**PART 2:**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Fahisham Taib</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia</b>