

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 21682

Title: Impaired swallowing mechanics of post radiation therapy head and neck cancer patients: A retrospective videofluoroscopic study

Reviewer's code: 02577402

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-08-01 15:44

Date reviewed: 2015-08-22 11:54

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors investigated the swallowing mechanics in patients with post-radiation treatment of head and neck cancer, with interesting results. However, a lot of problems existed. 1. Title: The current title is not good because it is too broad without any indication of the function of the patients with post-radiation treatment of head and neck cancer. A better title can be indicated if it is more specific. For example, The swallowing function is impaired in patients with post-radiation treatment of head and neck cancer using videofluoroscopy. 2. Abstract: This part is too long especially the METHODS and the RESULTS parts. Please shorten them and include only those important items. 3. Key words: Use the following key words which are better: Swallow mechanics, Post radiation, Head and neck cancer, Fluoroscopy, Anatomy 4. Introduction: This part is too long. Please shorten it to 1/3 the original length. The second sentence in paragraph 5 starting "The conventional approach to swallowing -----" is not good. Please rephrase it. 5. Materials and methods: Too long. Please shorten it to 1/3 the original length, and give only the major points here. 6. RESULTS: In this part, the expression is not good. For example, "Means and standard deviations and Mann-Whitney

-----“ in the first paragraph is not a good expression. It should be written as: The PAS scores were highly significantly ($P<0.0001$) greater in HNC (4.43 ± 2.42) than in the control (1.29 ± 0.56). Another example: “Means, standard deviations and two-tailed t-test-----“ in the second paragraph should be written as: “ The duration of laryngeal elevation was significantly ($P=0.002$) shorter in HNC ($0.29\pm0.11s$) than in the control ($0.48\pm0.23s$), and the displacement of the larynx towards the cranial base is significantly ($P=0.02$) shorter in HNC (0.89 ± 0.63 cm) than in the control (1.41 ± 0.73 cm). “ Please rewrite the whole RESULTS as indicated above. In the fourth paragraph in this part, is a significance ($P<0.05$) existed in the Mahalanobis distances and other parameters? Please give the P value. 7. Abbreviations: When first using an abbreviation, the full phrase should be given. For example, modified barium swallows (MBS). Later you can always use the abbreviation without mentioning the full phrase. However, the authors did not abide by this rule all the time. Although the authors had given the full phrase and the abbreviation in the first time using them, the authors gave the full phrase and the abbreviations again and again later in the text, including MBS and HNC. Please check the whole article and correct similar problems. In summary, this manuscript is transformed from a doctoral dissertation which is quite different from a journal article because a doctoral dissertation is usually very long with a lot of detailed information. However, a journal article is not long. Please shorten the whole manuscript based on the comments.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 21682

Title: Impaired swallowing mechanics of post radiation therapy head and neck cancer patients: A retrospective videofluoroscopic study

Reviewer's code: 00289418

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-08-01 15:44

Date reviewed: 2015-09-05 02:36

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" 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"/> The same title	<input checked="" 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 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 is a very good manuscript studying the effects of radiotherapy in the swallowing mechanism of patients. The method used, the evaluation of data and the presentation is excellent (very instructive figures, extensive statistics etc). The only disadvantage is its length. If you think that you could reduce it without leaving out critical information, it would probably be more easy for the reader to follow. A minor comment: check references 5 and 9 given in capitals