

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

Manuscript NO: 55725

Title: Lung cancer screening, what has changed after the latest evidence?

Reviewer's code: 03724953

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Doctor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Author's Country/Territory: Spain

Manuscript submission date: 2020-03-30

Reviewer chosen by: Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-04-07 14:02

Reviewer performed review: 2020-04-07 23:48

Review time: 9 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this minireview, Juan Carlos Trujillo- Reyes and colleagues compared the results of NEDerlands Leuvens Longkanker Screenings Onderzoek (NELSON) to the findings of the National Lung Screening Trial (NLST) in the lung cancer screening policy. Generally, the information is limited and the article is not well written. There are some suggestions or this article. 1. In the abstract, no results or conclusion was provided which make this section more like an introduction. 2. In the main text, many paragraphs are made up of only one sentence. Please revise the manuscript to logical paragraphs and avoid this condition. 3. In some issues, no reference is cited in whole section.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

Manuscript NO: 55725

Title: Lung cancer screening, what has changed after the latest evidence?

Reviewer's code: 02981504

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MA

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Spain

Manuscript submission date: 2020-03-30

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-03-31 01:28

Reviewer performed review: 2020-04-22 01:02

Review time: 21 Days and 23 Hours

Scientific quality	[<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Grade A: Excellent [<input type="radio"/>] Grade B: Very good [<input type="radio"/>] Grade C: Good [<input type="radio"/>] Grade D: Fair [<input type="radio"/>] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Grade A: Priority publishing [<input type="radio"/>] Grade B: Minor language polishing [<input type="radio"/>] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [<input type="radio"/>] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Accept (High priority) [<input type="radio"/>] Accept (General priority) [<input type="radio"/>] Minor revision [<input type="radio"/>] Major revision [<input type="radio"/>] Rejection
Re-review	[<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input type="radio"/>] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

"The aim of this paper is to review the latest results of the Netherlands Leuven Longkanker Screenings Onderzoek (NELSON) and compare them with the findings of the National Lung Screening Trial (NLST). Both the NELSON and the NLST have provided sufficient scientific evidence to warrant widespread screening. LDCT is currently the test of choice." The article is concise and fluent, and the conclusion is instructive to the clinical practice of lung cancer screening.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

Manuscript NO: 55725

Title: Lung cancer screening, what has changed after the latest evidence?

Reviewer's code: 02445408

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Cuba

Author's Country/Territory: Spain

Manuscript submission date: 2020-03-30

Reviewer chosen by: Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-04-07 17:40

Reviewer performed review: 2020-04-24 16:56

Review time: 16 Days and 23 Hours

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Lung cancer screening, what has changed after the latest evidence? COMMENTARIES

To authors: It is an interesting work according to the expectation that exists within the medical community to have a stronger tool to improve the results achieved in the two compared clinical trials that was presented. Running title and acknowledgments is absent- Please provide them.