



**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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

Manuscript NO: 41399

Title: The effects of muscle fiber orientation to main magnetic field on muscle metabolite profiles

Reviewer's code: 00607640

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Ying Dou

Date sent for review: 2018-08-23

Date reviewed: 2018-08-28

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 checked="" 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 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

The authors examined the effects of muscle fiber orientations on muscle metabolites using proton magnetic resonance spectroscopy. The results showed that the metabolite profiles in each orientation of muscle fibers to the main magnetic field were different

and further suggested careful positioning is one important factor to consider in studying proton magnetic resonance spectroscopy metabolites in muscles. These observations are interesting, and overall results are supported by the data in present study. It is suitable to the Journal and could be helpful in clinic study.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No



**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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

Manuscript NO: 41399

Title: The effects of muscle fiber orientation to main magnetic field on muscle metabolite profiles

Reviewer's code: 02566952

Reviewer's country: Romania

Science editor: Ying Dou

Date sent for review: 2018-09-12

Date reviewed: 2018-09-27

Review time: 15 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" 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 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

The technical manuscript describe the importance of acquisition protocol for obtaining data regarding muscle metabolites using magnetic resonance spectroscopy. Maybe it should be good to introduce the method of investigation within the title The effects of

muscle fiber orientation to main magnetic field on muscle metabolite profiles for MRS acquisition or something similar Please verify if word “wildly” (savage, wild) is what needs to be used in the core tip or maybe rather widely (largely) as it appears in the introduction text. At the research perspectives subchapter authors state practitioners should be careful in positioning the muscle and any organ, this is known to be true with practically any type of MRI acquisition. How do the authors think the patient should be positioned and what specific muscle types would be more relevant to investigate when trying to detect metabolic syndrome using IMCL/EMCL? Do the authors think a practical protocol could be designed at this stage or further studies will be needed. Given the fact MRS is non-invasive how feasible could be a clinical study in this respect?

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No



**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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

Manuscript NO: 41399

Title: The effects of muscle fiber orientation to main magnetic field on muscle metabolite profiles

Reviewer's code: 02577402

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Ying Dou

Date sent for review: 2018-09-25

Date reviewed: 2018-09-30

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input 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 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

In this MS, the authors studied the effects of muscle fiber orientation to main magnetic field on muscle metabolite profiles. Some problems existed. 1. The language needs to improve because of some grammar, spelling and punctuation mistakes. 2. In the

Statistical analysis section, please indicate the company, city and country of the manufacturer of the Origin version 8. 3. Use of abbreviation: when using abbreviations, the full phrase should be given at the first time of use. Later, you can always use the abbreviation without mentioning the full phrase. For example, magnetic resonance spectroscopy (MRS). However, the authors did not abide by this rule all the times. For example, the authors used NMR, SD without indicating the full phrase. Please check the whole article and correct all similar problems. 4. RESULTS: In the end of this section, the authors stated that "The comparisons between ----- was found to be significantly different than -----". Please indicate clearly how it was significantly different than that of other ratios and also give the significant P value. In this section, please state in clear and specific data. 5. Discussion: Please give some limitations before making a conclusion. At the end of the discussion, please use one or two sentences to make a conclusion which should be directly relevant to your results.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No