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: 29671
Title: Reporting rotator cuff tears on magnetic resonance arthrography using the Snyder's arthroscopic classification
Reviewer's code: 02577402
Reviewer's country: China
Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong
Date sent for review: 2016-08-24 16:31
Date reviewed: 2016-10-08 21:54

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[Y] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors investigated rotator cuff tears on MRA using the Snyder's arthroscopic classification. Some problems existed. 1. The language needs to be improved because of some grammar mistakes and mistyping. 2. Citation of figures: In the text, the figures should be cited in the order the figures appeared in the text. However, the authors first cited Figure 3, and then the authors pointed out that Figures 1-3 show MRA findings and corresponding arthroscopic confirmation. This is no good. Please cite the figures in the order they appeared in the text. 3. MRI in the DISCUSSION: The authors did not give the complete phrase of MRI before using the abbreviation MRI. Please indicate what MRI stands for. If you used only once this phrase, please just use the complete phrase. 4. Tables 4-6: IN these tables, the authors only pointed out reader 1. What about reader 2? Is there any difference between the scores given by reader 2 and the reference standards? Please explain. Also, please give the definition of A and B in these tables. 5. Conclusion: In the CONCLUSION in both the abstract and in the text, the tense should be present tense rather than the past tense.

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: 29671
Title: Reporting rotator cuff tears on magnetic resonance arthrography using the Snyder's arthroscopic classification
Reviewer's code: 02346872
Reviewer's country: China
Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong
Date sent for review: 2016-08-24 16:31
Date reviewed: 2016-10-13 20:07

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[Y] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Overall: The authors evaluate the diagnostic performance of MRA in evaluating RCTs using the Snyder's classification system for reporting MRA findings, evaluating its accuracy using arthroscopy as reference standard. They demonstrated high reproducibility of MRA in evaluating RCTs using the Snyder's classification as a method for reporting. This allows conclude that not only MRA but also the Snyder's classification has an intrinsic high diagnostic value. Even though originally created for arthroscopy, Snyder's classification is well suitable and may be adopted for routine reporting of MRA. However, there are some limitations. 1, there are not a structural abstract. 2, Arthroscopy was performed by several orthopedic surgeons with different experience in RCTs repair. Thus, certain degree of variability in RCTs scoring at the reference standard may be expected. 3, the delay between MRA and arthroscopy limited the reliability of the reference standard.