

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 22980

**Title:** Predictive model for contrast-enhanced ultrasound of the breast: Is it feasible in malignant risk assessment of BI-RADS 4 lesions?

**Reviewer's code:** 00742250

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2015-11-06 11:36

**Date reviewed:** 2015-11-07 05:49

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 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 is a good work. Abstract: The first line, contrast-enhanced ultrasound (CEUS).

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 22980

**Title:** Predictive model for contrast-enhanced ultrasound of the breast: Is it feasible in malignant risk assessment of BI-RADS 4 lesions?

**Reviewer's code:** 02510166

**Reviewer's country:** Martinique

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2015-11-06 11:36

**Date reviewed:** 2015-11-07 21:54

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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 an interesting paper with a fairly large number of patients. Minor comment: List of 10 enhanced patterns: make a table with the literature references of the patterns. Major comments: The methods are unsatisfying. There is a missing link between the 9 variables of Figure 3 (an over-fitted model!) and the 6 combinations of enhanced patterns (COEP). It should be clarified how the COEP were selected. The discussion suggests that the selection was empirical. The evaluation of the 6 COEP in separate models is confusing. It is unclear how the sensitivity-specificities of the COEP were computed: if these were computed in a subset of patients, then the conclusion do not apply to the study population; if these were computed on the whole study population, then the AUC should be compared with Figure 3's AUC. Assuming the COEP sensitivity-specificities were correctly computed, they do not appear to improve prediction of malignancy, the conclusion regarding the predictive value of the COEP should be mitigated.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 22980

**Title:** Predictive model for contrast-enhanced ultrasound of the breast: Is it feasible in malignant risk assessment of BI-RADS 4 lesions?

**Reviewer's code:** 00742249

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2015-11-06 11:36

**Date reviewed:** 2015-11-14 12:25

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	<input 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"/> [Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Comments: The authors evaluated the diagnostic usefulness of several predictive models of contrast-enhanced ultrasound (CEUS) for breast tumors. The authors claimed that CEUS models can predict malignant lesions more accurately and decrease false-positive biopsy. After reviewing the manuscript, I have concluded that World Journal of Radiology-22980 has high priority for publication in this journal, because this paper can offer new information or significant findings that enhance our knowledge of clinical aspects of breast diseases. For this reason, this paper can be acceptable for publication. That is all.