



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

Manuscript NO: 38745

Title: Evaluation of pineal cysts with magnetic resonance imaging

Reviewer's code: 02829306

Reviewer's country: India

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-03-13

Date reviewed: 2018-03-21

Review time: 8 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

major language correction is required before it can be reviewed.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:



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

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

BPG Search:

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



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

Manuscript NO: 38745

Title: Evaluation of pineal cysts with magnetic resonance imaging

Reviewer’s code: 02439215

Reviewer’s country: China

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-04-09

Date reviewed: 2018-04-15

Review time: 5 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 type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. When compared with the previous literature, the present study is lack of the same conditions which include the stage of the illness、 course of the disease as the previous literature. But it seems inevitable for the retrospective study. 2. The samples of follow up is few. All patients did not have contrast-enhanced imaging. None of the patients had



**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

histopathological examinations. 3. The literatures cited to compare with the present study in the recent five years are few. The references are not up-to-date. 4. I find a spelling mistake -----countur lobulation (in the last paragraph of MATERIALS AND METHODS) 5. How to determine the inclusion criteria and exclusion criteria. 6. The most important diagnosis of pineal cysts is that there is no significant occupying effect and no abnormal contrast enhancement. Not all patients in this study have enhanced MRI examination. 7. There is "Contrast-enhancement was detected in PCs of all 21 patients who had undergone contrast-enhanced MRI examination in results section, but in discussion section, "all patients did not have contrast-enhanced imaging".

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

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

BPG Search:

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