

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Radiology*

Manuscript NO: 75136

Title: Type 2 dynamic curves: a diagnostic dilemma

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05257465

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MS

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Turkey

Manuscript submission date: 2022-02-19

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-02-22 13:55

Reviewer performed review: 2022-03-01 01:00

Review time: 6 Days and 11 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Yes 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Yes 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? Yes, the authors found that comparisons of the type 2 dynamic curve and the BIRADS categories increased the sensitivity and specificity ratios for the assessment of breast lesions. 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? General. 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? Yes 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Yes 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Yes 11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? Yes 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented?



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Yes 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? Yes 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? Yes Specific Comments To Authors: The authors report an interest topic in DCE MRI for the diagnosis of breast lesions with focusing on the type 2 dynamic curves. And the authors found that AUC values, the sensitivity and specificity are increased for the detection of breast lesions by combining type 2 curves and morphological features. The finding of the study is useful for clinicians. Of course, more cases and multicenter experiments should be performed to confirm the reliability of the research conclusions.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Radiology*

Manuscript NO: 75136

Title: Type 2 dynamic curves: a diagnostic dilemma

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04668002

Position: Associate Editor

Academic degree: DDS, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Sweden

Author's Country/Territory: Turkey

Manuscript submission date: 2022-02-19

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-03-02 06:50

Reviewer performed review: 2022-03-02 07:18

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

01 Please provide the register number obtained from the ethical committee approval.
02 No sample size calculation was performed. Therefore, it is not actually possible to know whether the findings of the study are true findings or chance. 03 “The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to determine whether the data conformed to a normal distribution.” You checked the normal distribution of which parameters? And in order to use which kind of statistical tests? This is not clear. 04 Most of the Discussion section consists of paragraphs with pure literature review or with paragraphs beginning with a repetition of the results followed by the citation of the results of other studies, without an actual discussion of the findings of the study. The authors need to address this issue.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Radiology*

Manuscript NO: 75136

Title: Type 2 dynamic curves: a diagnostic dilemma

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04668002

Position: Associate Editor

Academic degree: DDS, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Sweden

Author's Country/Territory: Turkey

Manuscript submission date: 2022-02-19

Reviewer chosen by: Ya-Juan Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-28 07:57

Reviewer performed review: 2022-05-28 08:17

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

01 "The sample size was calculated using G power analysis (alpha error: 0.05, power: 90%); the minimum number of patients was thus defined as 31." I don't even know how could the authors possibly get "31" only with power and alpha. A power of 80% and alpha of 5% are usually common parameters to use in a power analysis. It is not possible to perform any power analysis only with these two components. Any power analysis has at least three components, the two already mentioned, and a third one, being either effect size, mean difference (for continuous variables), or incidence difference (for dichotomous variables). There is still need for values, coming from results of a previous study (or a pilot study), for which the authors need to be based on in order to perform a power analysis for their study. Therefore, nothing was really done, and "31" here is an imaginary baseless number.

02 "In our study, we investigated histopathological results of type 2 dynamic curves obtained from dynamic contrast magnetic resonance imaging, which plays a critical role in the evaluation of breast lesions. We found that the type 2 dynamic curve had a sensitivity of 40.2% and a specificity of 73.4% in predicting malignancy. Additionally, we found that combining type 2 dynamic curve with morphological findings increased sensitivity and specificity." According to the authors, this paragraph was added to the Discussion section in order to add more discussion to the manuscript. But this paragraph is nothing less than a pure repetition of the Results.

03 "According to these results, our study's malignity rates were higher than those reported in the literature, but the sensitivity and specificity rates were similar. This could be due to the small number of patients in our study, which is a limitation of our study. As supported by our findings and the literature, the type 2 dynamic curve indicates an increased risk of malignant lesions." Supported by which literature? Where are the references? "This could be due to the small number of patients in our study" How can a

small number of patients in the study possibly cause this? I thought that the authors had done a power analysis, and then this is contradictory. But the authors did not actually do any power analysis (see my first comment here). 04 The Discussion is still without discussion. Try to explain the reasons for your findings based on the literature. The only thing the authors have done was to add more description of the results to the Discussion, without a discussion per se.