

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27730

Title: Computed tomography and patient risk: Facts, perceptions and uncertainties

Reviewer's code: 02634762

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-06-17 13:47

Date reviewed: 2016-07-19 16:22

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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a well-written manuscript. Some minor revision is needed before publication.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27730

Title: Computed tomography and patient risk: Facts, perceptions and uncertainties

Reviewer's code: 02346872

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-06-17 13:47

Date reviewed: 2016-06-26 19:45

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input 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	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input 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 type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors reviewed the major concerns associated with the widespread use of CT and its radiation exposure incurred by patients. The paper discussed the following issues: 1. Radiation exposure and cancer risk with CT scanning 2. Perception of risk associated with diagnostic scanning 3. Dose reduction strategies 4. Rational scanning The authors recommended proposed the following strategies for CT scanning: 1. Justification 2. Dose optimization 3. Dose limitation In overall, this is a useful review. It reminded our medical members to adhere to up fundamental principles.