



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics*

Manuscript NO: 85826

Title: Radiation dose analysis of Computed Tomography Coronary Angiography in Children with Kawasaki Disease

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05242485

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2023-05-17

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-06-08 18:51

Reviewer performed review: 2023-06-13 13:51

Review time: 4 Days and 18 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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 checked="" 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 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

Authors present radiation dose as reported by the scanner console for a cohort of 85 children with Kawasaki disease undergoing computed tomography coronary angiography. Roughly 1 mSv was indicated and deemed acceptable. I urge the authors to review relevant literature in the Introduction instead of in Discussion (Table 3). Please also add this recent one: Borhanuddin BK, Latiff HA, Yusof AK. CT coronary angiogram in children with Kawasaki patients: experience in 52 patients. *Cardiology in the Young*. 2022 Dec;32(12):1994-8. Specific comments and minor edits: 1) ABSTRACT, Methods: “across the groups” -> “across the age groups”? 2) ABSTRACT&Results: “among children in the other groups” -> “between the other groups of children”? 3) Introduction: “non-visualization” -> “lack of visualization”? 4) Materials and methods, CTCA technique & Discussion: “achieve low radiation exposures” -> “minimize radiation exposures”? 5) Materials and methods, CTCA technique: “Care kV” -> “CARE kV”? 6) Materials and methods, CTCA technique: “mAs values ranged between...” -> “current-time product ranged between... mA.s”? 7) Results: “the increasing age” -> “increasing age”? “the age groups” -> “age groups”? 8) Discussion:



**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

“Total 85 children...” -> “In total...”? 9) Discussion: “CTCA demonstrated...” -> “CTCA can visualize...”? 10) Discussion: “This is clearly unacceptable in children.” Can you please elaborate the criterion here for “acceptable”? 11) Discussion: “lowering kVp and CARE Dose4D for tube current” Is the purpose here “for tube current”? Consider rephrase. 12) Discussion: “large area coverage” -> “large field of view”?



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics*

Manuscript NO: 85826

Title: Radiation dose analysis of Computed Tomography Coronary Angiography in Children with Kawasaki Disease

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05461375

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: FRCP, FRCPE, MBChB, MSc

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2023-05-17

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-06-29 02:46

Reviewer performed review: 2023-06-29 04:27

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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 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

Thanks for the invitation of reviewing this manuscript. I hope my comments can improve this manuscript further. 1) Would authors explain the nature of this study? Is this a retrospective or prospective study? The following information appear not consistent. Manuscript Type: Retrospective Study “We conducted an audit of the radiation dose from CTCA in children with KD.” “This observational study was carried out during the period December 2013 - February 2018. The study was approved by Departmental Publication Review Board (RDG/EC/Pub/27 dated July 03, 2020). Written informed consent was obtained from the parents.” 2)The reference number appears mixing up. The ICRP 103 is reference 20. Please verify the referencing accordingly. “conversion factors recommended by ICRP 103 (21) and analysis of radiation exposure across groups” 3) The methodology does not contain information on IV contrast agent. 4) Although no complicated statistical calculation involved, it should still contain “Statistical analysis” section in the methodology. 5) There’s typo for the Brand name. (Somatom Definition Flash, Siemens, Erlangen, Germany) CARE Dose4D (Seimens, Erlangen, Germany)



**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