

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 2622

Title: Diagnostic Advances New ultrasound techniques for lymph node evaluation

Reviewer code: 02493192

Science editor: Song, Xiu-Xia

Date sent for review: 2013-03-05 16:37

Date reviewed: 2013-03-12 11:54

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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6344 Diagnostic Advances New ultrasound techniques for lymph node evaluation Characterisation of lymphadenopathy Dear Authors, This is an interesting review that describes new ultrasound techniques in evaluation of lymphadenopathy. While the topic is interesting it is not presented in a format that is easy to read. Manuscript lacks basic information about the nature, mode of action and basic principles of multiple different imaging techniques that authors are describing in the manuscript. It is very important to describe first principles of imaging techniques and then discuss their usefulness in evaluation of lymphadenopathy. The quality of English language needs to be improved also and below there are the examples of sentences and words that in my opinion require change throughout the whole manuscript. 1. In the Abstract instead of "Conventional ultrasound (US) is the first imaging method..." the word "first" should be changed to "recommended" 2. In the sentence "guidance for LN puncture", puncture should be changed to "biopsy" 3. The sentence: "Complementary to size criteria, CEUS could also be used in the evaluation of changes of neoangiogenesis under antiangiogenic treatment." should be changed as follows: "CEUS could also be used to evaluate response of tumor angiogenesis to anti-angiogenic therapies" 4. Sentence: "In this paper the current literature is reviewed regarding the application of new and innovative US techniques for lymph node evaluation" should also be restructured e.g.: "In this paper we review current literature regarding evaluation of lymphadenopathy by new and innovative US techniques." 5. Sentence: "For imaging superficial LNs with a high frequency probe and for imaging the mediastinal and abdominal LNs with a high frequency endoscopic probe in CE-EUS currently 4.8mL for SonoVue? are recommended" should also be restructured e.g.: "Currently, ultrasound contrast agent SonoVue? is recommended for..." 6. Sentence: "Focal hypoenhancement



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

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

may be caused by overpressure in the LN caused by the neoplastic infiltration” – word overpressure should be clarified in this context 7. EFSUMB abbreviation should be explained All figures require additional explanation and very clear description of the most important findings they represent. The information in the figure legend is not sufficient for the reader to understand and interpret fully the figure content.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 2622

Title: Diagnostic Advances New ultrasound techniques for lymph node evaluation

Reviewer code: 02462366

Science editor: Song, Xiu-Xia

Date sent for review: 2013-03-05 16:37

Date reviewed: 2013-03-17 05:49

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	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript is a literature review on advances in sonographic techniques for lymph node detection. The topic and the abstract section are relevant to the manuscript. In the introduction section "Introductory considerations", in the second and the third paragraphs Doppler ultrasound is discussed in details. This is beyond the scope of introduction section. The fourth paragraph in the introduction section begins with "in conclusion", it is not appropriate to state conclusion there. There are typos both in manuscript body and in the table such as heterogenous---heterogeneous, Yu et alii--- et al., apperance---appearance, eccetric-eccentric?. In general this is a good summarization of the recent literature. In my opinion, further explanation of the mentioned sonographic techniques will improve the manuscript and it is needed for the readers of the journal. In my final opinion this manuscript could be accepted with minor revision.