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Reviewer's report:

In lines 46-47 the authors state that:
"They are characterized as either rapidly involuting or non-involuting based on their clinical progression, which are distinct from vascular malformations and infantile hemangiomas of the liver", citing Mulliken et al Michael Cohen Jr.
However, type 1 infantile liver hemangiomas according to Cohen, are present at birth, ie those are congenital liver hemangiomas, and those are rapidly involuting species.
In lines 46-47 the authors state that:
Parents and clinicians are advised to regularly monitor congenital hepatic hemangiomas, which reach full size 2 years after birth
However Cohen specifies that congenital hemangiomas whether rapidly involuting type or the non-involuting type have their maximum size at birth

Grammar is very bad throughout the article. Many parts should be rewritten. For example:
Line 66-67 All 6 cases involved consultations with other hospitals regarding targeted ultrasound examinations or suspected fetal anomalies and were associated with a different pregnant woman (mean age, 27 years; range, 22-31 years).

Line 70, 80 and several more throughout the paper:
enhanced computed tomography (CT) - did the authors mean "contrast-enhanced" ?

Line 73-74:
Sequoia 512; 74 Philips Electronics, Eindhoven, the Netherlands
The Sqoia 512 system is manufactured by Acuson Siemens

Line 93:
"lesions" instead of "lesion"

Line 99:
"above normal" - according to which reference ?

Lines 110-114:
Flow voids associated with intrallesional high-flow vessels were frequently seen. In addition to the large lesion in the left liver lobe in fetus 2, prenatal MRI also detected multiple low-echo nodules of various sizes scattered throughout the right liver lobe. The nodules were spherical
with clear boundaries and a relatively uniform internal echo. The echo in the liver parenchyma between the nodules was normal.

It is not clear to me how was the blood flow seen by MRI. Furthermore, the authors use the word "echo" several times on the paragraph relating to MRI - the correct term should be "intensity".

Line 121:
"were" instead of "was"

Line 125:
interventional therapy with pingyangmycin
The authors should explain what pingyangmycin is, what literature supports the use of this substance in such clinical scenario, why it was chosen for that particular case (the explanation "because his parents wished to control for heart failure as soon as possible" - is somewhat non-professional) and what alternatives were considered (ie embolization, resection, coiling etc)

Line 130:
The liver receives 1/4 of its blood supply from the hepatic artery and 3/4 from the portal vein
A reference for that statement is needed

Line 142-143:
Because they are infrequently reported in their literature, their incidence is not clear
What ????

Line 161:
These MRI findings agree with those of Dong et al. [19].
This sentence is not clear.

Line 36, 115, 184 replace "were centripetal enhancement" with "showed centripetal enhancement"

Line 186:
Numerous studies have shown that hormones can shrink hepatic hemangiomas[22-24]
Replace the word "hormones" with "corticosteroids" and omit reference 24, which is not relevant

Line 194-195:
accurate prenatal diagnosis and regular monitoring of 195 fetuses with huge hepatic hemangiomas improves prognosis and averts serious complications.
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