



## Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,  
315-321 Lockhart Road,  
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

### ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 8115

**Title:** Orbital Inflammatory Disease: Pictorial Review and Differential Diagnosis

**Reviewer code:** 02679622

**Science editor:** Zhai, Huan-Huan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-12-16 15:36

**Date reviewed:** 2013-12-29 13:06

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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 checked="" 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	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors present a generally well written superficial pictorial overview of the orbital inflammatory disease (OID). The following comments are noteworthy- -The figures provided do not have legends. The description of these figures is included in the text itself. The legends must be mentioned separately to go along with the figures. Further, the salient illustrative imaging points that the authors want to make in the text must be appropriately referred to the figures, as is customary in all scientific publications. -Authors mention about the role of Diffusion Weighted Imaging (DWI) in distinguishing dacryoadenitis and myositis from similar conditions. It would be highly desirable to include the supportive DWI illustrations to prove the point. -“An up-to-date overview of the best approaches to imaging work-up” as per the Manuscript Core Tip will benefit the context better if the other competing/ complementary modalities ± algorithm are stated. Otherwise, it would simply remain a pictorial MRI overview of OID. -References: Small stylistic changes regarding case to be corrected eg., Mri be replaced by MRI, at several places.



# Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,  
315-321 Lockhart Road,  
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 8115

**Title:** Orbital Inflammatory Disease: Pictorial Review and Differential Diagnosis

**Reviewer code:** 00505105

**Science editor:** Zhai, Huan-Huan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-12-16 15:36

**Date reviewed:** 2014-01-03 23:28

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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 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

Dear Authors, I reviewed the manuscript entitled as "Orbital Inflammatory Disease: Pictorial Review and Differential Diagnosis". this is a very good paper. I have just a few comment on it: 1. the figures are very low in numbers. such a radiologic review article should have many more than figures than this paper has. for example if you are talking about the differential diagnosis, you should include a figure to better show the findings. in dacryoadenitis, in myositis and others, readers expectation is to have at least one figure for each of them. 2. in differential diagnosis of myositis, I recommend the authors to include the carotid-cavernous fistula, so in some patients with low flow CCF, finding is very similar to myositis. 3. I think the authors should add the diffuse type of OID to its types. and write about its findings and differential diagnosis. 4. another type that it is better to be include here are the IgG4 associated orbitopathy. it would be better if the authors talk about this entity also.