

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Radiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 22239

**Title:** Diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging in cancer: Reported apparent diffusion coefficient, in-vitro and in-vivo reproducibility

**Reviewer's code:** 00289473

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2015-08-24 10:55

**Date reviewed:** 2015-09-12 14:02

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input 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 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

The paper topic is very interesting and the paper is clearly written. The paper search criteria/strategy should be clarified.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Radiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 22239

**Title:** Diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging in cancer: Reported apparent diffusion coefficient, in-vitro and in-vivo reproducibility

**Reviewer's code:** 00225289

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2015-08-24 10:55

**Date reviewed:** 2015-09-14 11:30

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"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		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

This paper reviews and summarise important issues on Diffusion-Weighted MR Imaging. It is comprehensive and clearly written. I have only a few minor suggestions: 1. title, the current title suggests the paper is focused on reproducibility of the ADC values. This paper is more than that, so the authors can modify the title so that it is more inclusive. 2. the abstract is written in an introduction manner, it will be more helpful to add some solid information, particularly the conclusion and recommendation. Pls re-write the abstract. 3. methodology of this paper. pls describe how did the authors select this 115 studies, and why the these 115 studies would represent a good overview? 4. Gallbladder: pls discuss whether the ROI is placed over the wall or biliary liquid and potential partial volume effect.