

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

Manuscript NO: 38139

Title: Traumatic peroneal split lesion with retinaculum avulsion: Diagnosis and post-operative multimodality imaging

Reviewer's code: 02256747

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-03-23

Date reviewed: 2018-03-23

Review time: 3 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1) It would better to include more peer work on the development of fluorescent/luminescent platforms in the introduction part. For example, a) Chem. Sci., 2018, 9, 1119; b) Sens. Actuator B-Chem., 2017, 243, 971; c) Anal. Chem., 2017, 89, 11679; d)

Chem. Sci., 2017, 8, 4756; e) J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2018, 140, 1686; f) J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2018, 10.1021/jacs.7b12817. 2) Among all the described anatomic variants that predispose to PB disease, how is the probability for each case? Is this related to the age or gender of patients? 3) For the diagnosis of PB disease, please also briefly introduce the common misdiagnose case for reference. 4) Regarding the therapeutic method described in this manuscript, it would be more convincing if the authors could possibly make a comparison between the method applied in this manuscript and other commonly used ones. 5) How much time would it be necessary for patient recovery in underdiagnosed case of PB split lesion? What's the difference for patient activity performance in this case?

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [Y] No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

Manuscript NO: 38139

Title: Traumatic peroneal split lesion with retinaculum avulsion: Diagnosis and post-operative multimodality imaging

Reviewer's code: 03065412

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-03-23

Date reviewed: 2018-03-31

Review time: 8 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Overall, an interesting case report. This would be benefitted by more detailed follow-up data - did the patient return to his previous activities? / were any outcome scores used? A description of the 'trans-osseous wiring' technique for the SPR repair



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https:// www.wjgnet.com

would be useful - what equipment was used. The post-op rehab protocol should be in the results section, not in the discussion section. I think 'agonist' is meant to be 'concentric'. The English is, at times, poor: Abstract: 'A lately diagnosis would have caused a worsening of symptomatology and an increase in recovery times.' Results: 'Regular the other tendons of the ankle.' Please review and revise the language quality of the paper.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [Y] No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [Y] No