

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Radiology*

Manuscript NO: 68675

Title: Impact of COVID-19 Pandemic on Radiology Education, Training, and Practice: A Narrative Review

Reviewer's code: 05471274

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Nepal

Author's Country/Territory: Barbados

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-30

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-02 10:11

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-02 11:16

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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



**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>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is written in the current and very relevant title for medical education. However, I have following recommendation to further improve the quality of the manuscript. 1. Consistent use of COVID-19. COVID-19 vs. COVID in some part of the manuscript 2. Though writing is understandable, content-wise it is very verbose. Advised to make more succinct conclusions and remarks. While going thru the manuscript, there is the redundancy of some content and overlapping. Though very few notable languages and write-up errors, it is there in some areas eg. “.40 .” please revisit and proofread to omit such minor errors. 3. Though this article is a narrative review, it is supposed to have clear methods, how it is carried out? I could not find any mention of search words, database searched, date of inclusion of published work, etc. Despite being a narrative review if authors could provide details of search findings, omission of duplicates, irrelevant papers, and papers reviewed in full text and those meeting criteria for inclusion, it would have been very clear (though PRISMA flow diagram is not required for narrative, a simple framework of study selection would have made methods more clear). Without such details, it is very difficult for replication. And replicability is a vital part of any research work. If proper heading eg. Methods, result, discussion is provided with a relevant subheading, I suppose it will be clearer and less verbose. 4. I got surprised to see, only a few studies were selected in a table included in the paper. What was the basis of selecting those ten papers? What about the quality of those papers? It is very vital to make these things clear to avoid selection bias of included paper and to avoid drawing bias conclusion being it is just a narrative review. Please kindly justify these and make it very clear to readers. 5. The conclusion itself is very long nearly a page with 299 words. Please avoid the waste word and make it succinct and clear without any bias.



**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