

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Gastroenterology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRGA_124182
Title of the Manuscript:	Fibroscan®: Indications and Results in ambulatory patients
Type of the Article	Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is significant as it explores the clinical utility of Fibroscan® in managing chronic liver diseases, which has wide-ranging applications in hepatology. The data derived from this large patient cohort supports Fibroscan's® role as a non-invasive diagnostic tool, offering insight into liver fibrosis and steatosis assessment. This work contributes to improving patient care by presenting real-world results and aligning them with clinical practices. However, some sections need refinement for better clarity	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable and accurately reflects the scope of the manuscript. No changes needed.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive but could benefit from a concluding sentence that emphasizes the clinical impact of Fibroscan®. Also, simplifying some of the data-heavy parts would make it easier for a broader audience to understand.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript structure is appropriate. However, breaking up dense sections in the results with bullet points or additional subheadings could improve readability.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study appears scientifically robust, utilizing a large cohort of patients and demonstrating consistent data analysis. The comparison of Fibroscan® results with disease etiology is well-conducted. However, the discussion could benefit from more recent references and a deeper analysis of study limitations such as the retrospective design and potential confounders like obesity.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	While sufficient, the references rely on older studies. Including more recent literature (2021-2023) will strengthen the manuscript, especially in the discussion of Fibroscan's® latest technological advancements.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language Quality: The language quality is acceptable for scholarly communication. However, a minor editorial revision to enhance fluency and correct occasional grammatical errors would be beneficial.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript provides a valuable contribution to the field of hepatology, but minor revisions in data presentation, clarity, and the inclusion of recent studies would enhance its impact.	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bhaskar Pandey
Department, University & Country	Breach Candy Hospital Trust Mumbai, India