



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

Manuscript NO: 39268

Title: Significance of an additional unenhanced scan in CT angiography of patients with suspected acute aortic syndrome

Reviewer's code: 03764889

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Jin-Lei Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-05-04

Date reviewed: 2018-05-21

Review time: 17 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I enjoyed reading the manuscript. It provides clear evidence and concise explanation for the importance of the non-contrast enhanced scan in the setting of suspected AAS. You have explained the limitations well. As the images were selected specifically to answer



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

this question there is no way the figures can or should be extrapolated back to your 'normal population'. A few typos. The first few lines of the introduction are of interest but not specifically of relevance to the question.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

Manuscript NO: 39268

Title: Significance of an additional unenhanced scan in CT angiography of patients with suspected acute aortic syndrome

Reviewer’s code: 02511891

Reviewer’s country: Turkey

Science editor: Jin-Lei Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-06-06

Date reviewed: 2018-06-06

Review time: 3 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Editor In this well written paper, Panagiotopoulos et al. assessed potential benefits of an additional unenhanced acquisition in CTA patients with suspected acute aortic syndrome. They retrospectively evaluated 103 aortic CTA. They concluded that IMH is a



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

common and difficult to detect entity of AAS. They stated that an additional unenhanced acquisition within an aortic CTA protocol facilitates the detection of IMH. I suggest correct some minor typos and revise few points 1- In key words ----- Pulmonary trunc --- should be replaced by Pulmonary trunk 2- Under Scan Protocol section ----- Iodized contrast -----should be replaced by Iodinated contrast 3- Complications and secondary findings ----- hamorrhage --- hemorrhage 4- Complications and secondary findings ----- hematothorax--- hemothorax 5- There is very good review in World J Radiol. This should be discussed and included in references too. Multi-detector computed tomography in the diagnosis and management of acute aortic syndromes. Hallinan JT, Anil G. World J Radiol. 2014 Jun 28;6(6):355-65. doi: 10.4329/wjr.v6.i6.355. Review. PMID: 24976936 6- Statistical methods section should be improved. Including chi-square and other performed analysis. 7- The term Subadventital should be replaced by Subadventitial --- throughout the text. 8- Figure 4 needs to be improved

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- [] The same title
- [] Duplicate publication
- [] Plagiarism
- [Y] No

BPG Search:

- [] The same title
- [] Duplicate publication
- [] Plagiarism



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

[Y] No



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

Manuscript NO: 39268

Title: Significance of an additional unenhanced scan in CT angiography of patients with suspected acute aortic syndrome

Reviewer’s code: 03845802

Reviewer’s country: United States

Science editor: Jin-Lei Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-06-06

Date reviewed: 2018-06-11

Review time: 4 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article is well written except for minor points as mentioned below. The authors conducted a good methodology or an interesting topic and well identified the limitation of the study which is mainly the small number of patients included in the study,



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

nevertheless; I believe the article is suitable for publication in The World Journal of Radiology Major Points None Minot Points - Each abbreviation should be defined in the first mention, eg CT- Computed Tomography, ECG = Electrocardiography..etc - The authors used some abbreviations that should not be mentioned in professional writing eg pts for patients and tab for table - The article has multiple typo error, for example, Pulmonary trunc , hamorrhage..etc - The first part of the introduction is less relevant and should be deleted.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No