



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 22821

Title: Cumulative radiation exposure from diagnostic imaging in ICU patients

Reviewer’s code: 02577402

Reviewer’s country: China

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-10-06 00:06

Date reviewed: 2015-11-01 09:58

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|---|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| | | BPG Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | |
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors studied the CED from diagnostic imaging in ICU patients with good results. Some problems existed. 1. Use of abbreviations: When first using an abbreviation, the full phrase should be given. For example, cumulative effective radiation dose (CED). Later, you can always use the abbreviation CED without mentioning the full phrase. However, the authors did not abide by this rule all the time. In the text, the authors just used the abbreviations without mentioning the full phrases. Even if you had mentioned the abbreviations in the abstract, you should give the full phrases in the text. A lot of abbreviations were not given the full phrases, for example, CT, ICU, ITU in DISCUSSION, MRI etc. Please give the full phrase the first time using them. Check the whole article and correct all similar problems. 2. References: In the fourth paragraph in the DISCUSSION, the authors mentioned “similar to previous studies assessing CED-----”, here no references were given. Please give the references for the “previous studies. 3. Tables: In the tables, please give the full phrases of the abbreviations using a note below the table. 4. Figures: Please explain the abbreviations by giving the full phrases like “abdo, ct, xr, tap, ced” etc.



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 22821

Title: Cumulative radiation exposure from diagnostic imaging in ICU patients

Reviewer's code: 00575396

Reviewer's country: Brazil

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-10-06 00:06

Date reviewed: 2015-11-07 07:02

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|---|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | BPG Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | |
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is a paper about radiation from diagnostic imaging I have the following suggestions: Please, would you compare the rates of ionizing x non-ionizing radiation? Table 1 and 2: please, include abbreviations at the end of the Tables.



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 22821

Title: Cumulative radiation exposure from diagnostic imaging in ICU patients

Reviewer’s code: 02346872

Reviewer’s country: China

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-10-06 00:06

Date reviewed: 2015-11-10 11:38

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|---|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| | | BPG Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | |
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Title: The main title accurately reflects the major topic and content of the study. Abstract: The abstract present the advantages and significant points related to the background, objectives, materials and methods, results, and conclusions. Materials and Methods: The materials and methods sufficiently described for the results and conclusions. Results: The results provide sufficient data to draw firm scientific conclusions. Discussion: The conclusions are drawn appropriately supported by the literature. Overall: This is a prospective, interdisciplinary study conducted in the ICU of a large tertiary referral and level 1 trauma center. This is a valuable study. This report may be useful in keep radiation exposures from diagnostic imaging as low as reasonably practical and CED should be minimized where feasible, especially in young patients.