PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

Manuscript NO: 58496

Title: Magnetic resonance imaging findings of redundant nerve roots of the cauda equina

Reviewer's code: 03699990

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Chief Doctor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Turkey

Manuscript submission date: 2020-07-24

Reviewer chosen by: Ya-Juan Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-09-22 11:16

Reviewer performed review: 2020-09-29 08:46

Review time: 6 Days and 21 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The redundant nerve root syndrome （RNRs）of the cauda equina has been discussed sporadically in both the neurological and radiological literature of English. Although it is well observed in the cauda equina as a thick, elongated and tortuous nerve root on T2-weighted MR images，this condition has been relatively underrecognized in radiological practice. The paper helps to improve radiologists' understanding of RNRs and remind radiologists to pay attention to RNRs. The paper seems to have room for improvement as following. Paper `S AIM is to evaluate lumbar MRI findings of RNRs of cauda equina were in spinal stenosis patients. So in my opinions, the content of the" materials and methods "and the content of the" results" need to be adjusted appropriately.   In materials and methods, it is best to state including the following at least. Patients ：Patient selection（How to screen），the age and gender distribution of patients, and a brief description of clinical symptoms. MR imaging: equipment, sequence and parameters. MR evaluation：Who assessed？ Evaluation standards of RL, CSA and indentation types. Results：It's best to descript in paragraphs. MR findings of RNRs，Location, RL, CSA of RNRs Table 2. The entries in red font are improper. What can Table 3 indicate? Please explain. The syntax and expression of the paper need to be improved.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

On the whole, this is a well-written article with readability. I suggest that the authors make the following changes: In clinical practice, the term for a herniated disc is usually "disc herniation" rather than "disc indentation". Disc herniation can be divided into soft herniation or hard herniation. The former is a herniated disc tissue, and the latter is a hyperplastic osteophyte. The author's classification method in the article is of little significance because it cannot guide clinical treatment.