

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

Manuscript NO: 32172

Title: Incidental extravascular findings in computed tomographic angiography for planning or monitoring endovascular aortic aneurysm repair: Smoker patients, increased lung cancer prevalence?

Reviewer's code: 02577402

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-03-20

Date reviewed: 2017-03-21

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors investigated increased lung cancer in patients with CTA for EVAR planning. Some problems existed. 1. Abstract: What does 10 p/y mean? 2. Key words: Please use computed tomography instead of CT. 3. Conclusion in the text: When making a summary or conclusion, please do not use citations. If you want to cite others' work, it means you have not finished the discussion. Once you finish the discussion and want to make a conclusion, it means you only make a summary of what you have discussed. No citations. 4. Limitations of the study: In this study, the authors put "limitations" behind the CONCLUSION, which is not correct. The limitations should be put before the CONCLUSION. 5. A few language mistakes existed in the text.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

Manuscript NO: 32172

Title: Incidental extravascular findings in computed tomographic angiography for planning or monitoring endovascular aortic aneurysm repair: Smoker patients, increased lung cancer prevalence?

Reviewer's code: 00646357

Reviewer's country: Egypt

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-03-20

Date reviewed: 2017-03-27

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is well writtern and needs minor language polishing

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

Manuscript NO: 32172

Title: Incidental extravascular findings in computed tomographic angiography for planning or monitoring endovascular aortic aneurysm repair: Smoker patients, increased lung cancer prevalence?

Reviewer's code: 01560036

Reviewer's country: Russia

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-03-20

Date reviewed: 2017-03-27

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper is good written but does not contain anything new.