

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8306

Title: Imaging of Multiple Myeloma: Current Concepts

Reviewer code: 00503125

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-12-25 14:56

Date reviewed: 2013-12-26 08:09

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this paper the imaging options for patients with multiple myeloma were reviewed which include routine X-rays, CT scanning, MRI scanning and PET imaging. Although this is a nice review of the efficacy of these imaging strategies in this patient population, I do not appreciate much that is new in this manuscript. In particular some discussion needs to be provided as to how the information in this paper changes the management of these patients.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8306

Title: Imaging of Multiple Myeloma: Current Concepts

Reviewer code: 00225328

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-12-25 14:56

Date reviewed: 2014-01-08 00:36

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. This manuscript provides a good review of the advantages and disadvantages of various imaging techniques in the evaluation of multiple myeloma. The paper is well written. 2. Since this paper emphasizes current concepts. DWI should be elaborated. A paper "Multiple myeloma treatment response assessment with whole-body dynamic contrast-enhanced MR imaging. Radiology. 2010; 254:521-31" could be mentioned 3. Dynamic contrast enhanced MRI is another novel MRI that should also be mentioned. It has been reported to be valuable for response assessment. Please refer to "Multiple myeloma treatment response assessment with whole-body dynamic contrast-enhanced MR imaging. Radiology. 2010;254):521-31. If the authors feel that it is appropriate, the last sentence of the conclusion should be modified. . 4. The reference list is not well searched: some of the references are entirely arbitrary , for example, last sentence in page 10, reference 11, 13. Some of the references do not correspond to the fact shown in a sentence. For example, page 13, reference 20 (dated 1967, not a so-called "recent" study). 5. A similar review " Current concepts in the evaluation of multiple myeloma with MR imaging and FDG PET/CT. RadioGraphics 2010; 30:127-142" should be appended and discussed. 6. MRI protocols varied considerably in the literature. It would be nice if the authors can suggest one so that the readers can follow.