

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Hepatology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRHE_128270
Title of the Manuscript:	Non alcoholic fatty liver disease examined by FIBROSCAN-AST (FAST) score and the risk of colorectal carcinoma- A case controlled study
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript titled " <i>Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease Examined by FIBROSCAN-AST (FAST) Score and the Risk of Colorectal Carcinoma – A Case-Controlled Study</i> " holds significant importance for the scientific community because It explores the potential link between NAFLD, a growing public health concern, and colorectal cancer, a major cause of cancer-related mortality. By using the FAST score, which combines liver stiffness and AST levels for accurate NAFLD assessment, the study offers a non-invasive and practical approach for identifying high-risk individuals. These findings could enhance early detection strategies, improve patient stratification for colorectal cancer screening, and contribute to better understanding of the systemic impacts of metabolic liver diseases	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is suitable	
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 concisely summarizes the study's purpose, methods, and key findings Key statistics and outcomes are presented clearly The objective could be clearer by specifying the intended hypothesis or research question. It can be revised as "To determine whether NAFLD, identified by FAST scoring, is associated with an increased risk of colorectal cancer" Include specific p-values and odds ratios in the abstract to strengthen the summary	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The topic is a very fascinating one and references should be robust. The references are not sufficient and consisted of some old references. For example, references number 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 14, and 15 are not recent.	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communication but need some improvement.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>INTRODUCTION:</p> <p>The introduction effectively sets the context for NAFLD and its potential link to colorectal cancer. It also provides relevant statistics and a clear rationale for the study.</p> <p>However,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. some sentences are complex and could be simplified for clarity. For example, "The NAFLD, regarded as a chronic systemic inflammatory state characterized by increased inflammation." can be revised as "NAFLD is a chronic systemic inflammatory state with elevated inflammatory markers." 2. Under mechanism of Tumorigenesis, while mechanisms are mentioned, the connection to CRC could be elaborated. I suggest the author expand on how metabolic syndrome and insulin resistance specifically contribute to colorectal cancer risk <p>METHODOLOGY:</p> <p>The methods section provides detailed steps, including inclusion/exclusion criteria and diagnostic techniques and the use of FibroScan and FAST scoring is appropriate for assessing NAFLD.</p> <p>However,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The study design should clarify how cases and controls were matched. Were they matched by age, gender, or other factors? 2. Sample size justification should provide more context or citations for the odds ratio used to calculate the sample size. 3. The authors should identify potential confounders (e.g., dietary habits, physical activity) and state how they were managed or adjusted for in the analysis. <p>RESULTS:</p> <p>The results are presented in tables and figures that are easy to interpret and the statistical tests used are appropriate for the data.</p> <p>However,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The results section includes repetitive statements about data that are already in tables. I suggest the authors summarize key findings and avoid duplicating the table content. 2. The authors should ensure consistency in reporting p-values (e.g., use two decimal places consistently). 3. I suggest the authors discuss the clinical relevance of CAP and LSM values in more detail, especially their significance thresholds <p>DISCUSSION:</p> <p>The discussion connects the findings to existing literature effectively and the implications of the findings for clinical practice are well noted.</p> <p>However,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The limitations section is well-articulated but could acknowledge potential bias in case selection. It can be revised as "Selection bias might be present due to the single-center design and specific inclusion criteria." 	

Review Form 3

	<p>2. The discussion could benefit from a deeper exploration of the biological mechanisms linking NAFLD and CRC thereby emphasizing mechanistic insights</p> <p>3. The authors should clearly outline specific future research directions, such as larger multicenter studies or longitudinal designs.</p> <p>CONCLUSION:</p> <p>The conclusion succinctly summarizes the study's main finding</p> <p>However,</p> <p>1. The authors should consider adding a sentence on how clinicians might use FAST scoring in routine CRC risk assessments (Clinical implications)</p> <p>REFERENCES:</p> <p>1. The authors should ensure consistent formatting of references (e.g., italicizing journal names).</p> <p>2. Some references are slightly dated; consider adding more recent studies to strengthen the literature base.</p> <p>GENERAL LANGUAGE AND FORMATTING:</p> <p>1. The manuscript contains several grammatical errors and awkward phrasings. I suggest Proofread thoroughly or consider professional editing for language polishing.</p> <p>2. Standardize capitalization (e.g., "Methodology" instead of "methodology")</p> <p>3. Ensure all figures and tables are clearly labeled and referenced within the text.</p> <p>OVERALL EVALUATION:</p> <p>The study addresses an important and under-researched area. However, improvements in clarity, methodology transparency, and discussion depth are needed to enhance the manuscript's quality and impact.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Samuel Abiodun Kehinde
Department, University & Country	Ajayi Crowther University, Nigeria