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PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?
No - there are minor issues

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?
No - there are minor issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?
No - there are minor issues

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?
Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?
No - there are minor issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound?
If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS:
The manuscript described the results of a study to evaluate the value of conventional ultrasound versus contrast enhanced ultrasound in the differential diagnosis between hepatic alveolar echinococcosis and intrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma. The manuscript is well organized and appropriately written. Please consider the following minor points when revising your manuscript.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:
- The following sentence (statistical analysis) is unnecessary for the abstract: "The sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), negative predictive value (NPV) and receiver
operating characteristic (ROC) curves were calculated". It can be replaced by primary or secondary outcome measures.

- There is no background information or description of the problem to support the study rationale in your abstract. You have only mentioned the study objectives in your abstract. I would add one or two sentences as the lead of the abstract to provide an introduction to the main study topic, to highlight the gap in knowledge and the motivation or rationale for the study.
- More relevant key words are needed.
- This abbreviation is not previously defined in full in the text. Please note that all abbreviations (such as FLL) need to be defined in full at their first appearance in the text.
- Instead of "Materials and methods", please use "Patients and methods".
- Please be more specific about "bileduct dilation". Intra-hepatic or extra-hepatic biliary ducts? How did you define biliary ductal dilation? Did you match for the patient's age?
- Although you briefly mention the need for further studies, the statement is rather general. I suggest elaborating on this statement with a few directions for future research that are supported by your current results and would benefit the field.
- The quality of the provided images is suboptimal with low signal to noise ratio.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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