



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Radiology*

Manuscript NO: 82467

Title: Future of prostate imaging - artificial intelligence in assessing prostatic magnetic resonance imaging

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 06090125

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Lecturer, Technical Editor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Iraq

Author’s Country/Territory: Bulgaria

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-19

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-10 17:50

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-12 07:05

Review time: 1 Day and 13 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The work is somehow new but several limitations from the English to the technical hinder to grasp the main point of the work, some of them are listed below: 1- In my opinion, the abstract is too cumbersome and is hard to catch the key point. The keywords need to be more detailed. 2- Proofread the manuscript, with particular attention to grammatical mistakes and improved the formatting of text, figures, and tables. 3- The manuscript structure is too short and must be elaborated in the technology they applied as well support more rigorous technical aspects. 4- An introduction should clearly highlight the motivation, problem statement, the objective of the paper, gap in the existing research and the novelty of the conducted research. 5- The contributions presented in this manuscript are not sufficient for possible publication in this journal. I highly suggest authors to clearly define the contributions. 6- Many details are missing and others unclear. 7- The conclusions in this manuscript are primitive. Write your conclusions. 8- The manuscript is hard to be understood and words should be improved.

Additional References: The following articles could be useful: -Has the Future Started? The Current Growth of Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning, and Deep Learning.



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

<https://doi.org/10.52866/ijcsm.2022.01.01.013> -A diagnostic testing for people with
appendicitis using machine learning techniques.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11042-022-11939-8>



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Radiology*

Manuscript NO: 82467

Title: Future of prostate imaging - artificial intelligence in assessing prostatic magnetic resonance imaging

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 06073015

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor, Postdoc, Surgeon

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: China

Author’s Country/Territory: Bulgaria

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-19

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-02 03:11

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-02 03:35

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors wrote a review regarding AI for prostate cancer diagnostic algorithms. I think this paper showed AI assists the specialist in accurately segmenting the prostate and determining the prostate carcinoma's localization, exact characterization, and determination of its volume and staging according to the current Prostate Imaging Reporting & Data System (PI-RADS) classification. Good design and prospective! I only recommended the author to add some new imaging modalities such as PSMA PET-CT involved in the diagnosis and treatment for prostate cancer which also has AI algorithms now.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Radiology*

Manuscript NO: 82467

Title: Future of prostate imaging - artificial intelligence in assessing prostatic magnetic resonance imaging

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05764104

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: Doctor, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Senior Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Russia

Author's Country/Territory: Bulgaria

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-19

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-01 05:58

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-12 16:16

Review time: 11 Days and 10 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is devoted to the state-of-the-art and prospects of using artificial intelligence (AI) in prostate imaging. The authors intended it as a minireview. Its topic is definitely relevant and such a review could be of great interest to the readers. Unfortunately, in my view, the authors failed to cope with their task. The text has more the semblance of a “bulletin of progress and prospects” than of a scientific paper and could be published in a popular science journal but not in a scientific one. That is why I cannot recommend its publication in the form it is currently submitted in. I suggest that the authors refine their manuscript. I am sending five comments to them and very much like to get their reply. Only after getting it I will be able to decide whether to recommend their manuscript for publication in the World Journal of Radiology. Comments 1. The main fault of the manuscript is that it is too short even for minireview and only scratches the surface of the subject. The authors write about AI application but “neural network”, the fundamental AI term, is met only once. The main body of information is given in Table 1, which presents AI products available for use. But in fact, they are only listed and their description is very limited. No information is given on the AI methods and



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

algorithms used in these products. I ask the authors to clear this trouble by adding a description of AI method and algorithms for prostate imaging. This will give more sound to the scientific content of the manuscript. Needless to say the description must be no longer than required for a minireview. 2. Only a single figure is given in the manuscript. It is not enough. I would recommend the authors to give some other examples of images and, possibly, illustrative schemes that demonstrate AI application in prostate imaging. Visual attractiveness must add respectability to the manuscript. 3. I would advise the authors to rewrite Section "Conclusion". Now it looks an Incomplete List of Inferences rather than a Conclusion. Standardly, Conclusion section should first review, analyze and systematize all results the authors obtained and only then, on the basis of these results, formulate the final conclusion and, possibly, announce future research. 4. The list of References has only 22 entries – too small even for a minireview. I think this fault is the easiest to remove. If the authors will describe AI methods and algorithms (see Comment 1), they will have to refer to appropriate references which must be as many as to make the total number of entries in the list about 50 or so. 5. On whole, the English of the manuscript is not bad. However, there are errors both in grammar and in style. Several examples are provided below. It should be noted that the language problem can be a reason to reject the manuscript. That is why I recommend the authors to carefully test each phrase in the text for errors. Examples of errors 5.1. Page 3, Core tip, the first sentence. I think the phrase "using artificial intelligence in prostate cancer" is not correct. May be "in prostate cancer diagnosis"? 5.2. Page 6, line 4. "Nevertheless, a study by Gaur et al. Reduction of the time of interpretation of studies with the help of artificial intelligence is possible." What authors do want to say? 5.3. Page7, line 7. The word "quantitive" should be "quantitative".



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Radiology*

Manuscript NO: 82467

Title: Future of prostate imaging - artificial intelligence in assessing prostatic magnetic resonance imaging

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06090125

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Lecturer, Technical Editor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iraq

Author's Country/Territory: Bulgaria

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-19

Reviewer chosen by: Xiao-Fang Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-24 14:10

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-25 10:47

Review time: 20 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In. the revised manuscript, the authors have addressed all my concerns, as a result, the reviewer would like to recommend this manuscript publish as is.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Radiology*

Manuscript NO: 82467

Title: Future of prostate imaging - artificial intelligence in assessing prostatic magnetic resonance imaging

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 05764104

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: Doctor, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Senior Scientist

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Russia

Author’s Country/Territory: Bulgaria

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-19

Reviewer chosen by: Xiao-Fang Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-24 05:31

Reviewer performed review: 2023-04-03 09:25

Review time: 10 Days and 3 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

As for the manuscript, I can say that the authors have done a good job to respond to the reviewers' comments and reduce their manuscript to a form acceptable for publication. I am ready to recommend its publication in the World Journal of Radiology. The only thing I ask the authors to do is to check Table 1 - it was not reproduced well in the manuscript file 82467_Auto_Edited.docx I downloaded.