



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 85054

**Title:** Diffusion tensor imaging in the courtroom: Distinction between scientific specificity and legally admissible evidence

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer’s code:** 05586741

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** Doctor, DPhil

**Professional title:** Professor, Science Editor Development Department Director

**Reviewer’s Country/Territory:** United States

**Author’s Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-04-10

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-05-01 12:06

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-05-02 19:15

**Review time:** 1 Day and 7 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Novelty of this manuscript</b>	<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 novelty
<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<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



<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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**

If possible, please add a table listing all reviewed articles or categories with primary focus and points. It is better to add a summary section to summarize main findings including the reviewing highlights etc. This might be a side review of point: although the manuscript is comprehensive in contents and details, sometimes it might be better to be concise and pinpoint the main scientific findings. Integration of DTI with other imaging metrics for complementary diagnostic tool is important, please add this point in the end of the article. Also briefly mention general picture of neuroimaging findings in TB and cite related articles of more DTI methods and quantifications, including limitations and challenges.



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 85054

**Title:** Diffusion tensor imaging in the courtroom: Distinction between scientific specificity and legally admissible evidence

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer’s code:** 05198640

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** DSc, MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Full Professor

**Reviewer’s Country/Territory:** Bulgaria

**Author’s Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-04-10

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-05-14 09:07

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-05-14 09:28

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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
<b>Novelty of this manuscript</b>	<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 novelty
<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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**

This is a most interesting and comprehensive analysis of how scientific and clinical evidence about the use of diffusion tensor imaging in court proceedings as a potential proof about the extent of traumatic brain injury. It raises exciting conceptual concerns of pragmatical significance about the rationale behind scientific evidence and legal proof. Therefore authors are advised to also consider some earlier contributions of direct relevance to the topic of the study: [https://www.pdcnet.org/bjp/content/bjp\\_2018\\_0010\\_0001\\_0027\\_0036](https://www.pdcnet.org/bjp/content/bjp_2018_0010_0001_0027_0036) Also, given the lack of explicit search strategy to undeprin traditional literature review, and the clear expression of personal professional and expert statements, I would rather recommen to re-classify this work as "Opinion Review".