

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Radiology*

Manuscript NO: 90000

Title: Evaluating pediatric ureteropelvic junction obstruction: Dynamic magnetic resonance urography versus renal scintigraphy 99m-technetium mercaptoacetyl triglycine

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03337874

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: BM BCh, FACS, FRCS, FRCS (Ed)

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Pakistan

Author's Country/Territory: France

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-20

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-27 17:10

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-06 17:30

Review time: 9 Days

Scientific quality	☐ Grade A: Excellent ☐ Grade B: Very good ☒ Grade C: Good ☐ Grade D: Fair ☐ Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	☐ Grade A: Excellent ☒ Grade B: Good ☐ Grade C: Fair ☐ Grade D: No novelty

Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	☐ Grade A: Excellent ☒ Grade B: Good ☐ Grade C: Fair ☐ Grade D: No creativity or innovation
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	☐ Grade A: Excellent ☒ Grade B: Good ☐ Grade C: Fair ☐ Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	☐ Grade A: Priority publishing ☐ Grade B: Minor language polishing ☒ Grade C: A great deal of language polishing ☐ Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	☐ Accept (High priority) ☐ Accept (General priority) ☐ Minor revision ☒ Major revision ☐ Rejection
Re-review	☒ Yes ☐ No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: ☒ Anonymous ☐ Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: ☐ Yes ☒ No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for invitation to review the manuscript. It is a good study and will a new knowledge. Authors has compared MR Urography and MAG-3 renal scan as tools to diagnose obstruction (PUJO) in cases of hydronephrosis. I suggest as follows: 1. English language and brevity need attention to trim the manuscript. There is redudency in introduction and discussion. I suggest to focus the discussion around these two diagnostic modalities. 2. Methods needs a review by a radiologist (s) experienced in MR urography and MAG-3 renal scan. 3. I will suggest to publish as preliminary study as the number of patients is small. More patients needs to be added to strengthen the scientific value of study and meaningfull "P1" values

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Radiology*

Manuscript NO: 90000

Title: Evaluating pediatric ureteropelvic junction obstruction: Dynamic magnetic resonance urography versus renal scintigraphy 99m-technetium mercaptoacetyl triglycine

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04551037

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, MSc

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: France

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-20

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-12-07 18:42

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-14 18:54

Review time: 7 Days

Scientific quality	☐ Grade A: Excellent ☐ Grade B: Very good ☐ Grade C: Good ☒ Grade D: Fair ☐ Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	☐ Grade A: Excellent ☒ Grade B: Good ☐ Grade C: Fair ☐ Grade D: No novelty

Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	☐ Grade A: Excellent ☐ Grade B: Good ☒ Grade C: Fair ☐ Grade D: No creativity or innovation
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	☐ Grade A: Excellent ☐ Grade B: Good ☒ Grade C: Fair ☐ Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	☐ Grade A: Priority publishing ☒ Grade B: Minor language polishing ☐ Grade C: A great deal of language polishing ☐ Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	☐ Accept (High priority) ☐ Accept (General priority) ☐ Minor revision ☒ Major revision ☐ Rejection
Re-review	☒ Yes ☐ No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: ☒ Anonymous ☐ Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: ☐ Yes ☒ No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is a promising study in terms of emphasizing the use of MRU in the pediatric population, but it has many shortcomings. First of all, the methodology is explained too complicatedly, it is not clear which patients were given MRU or scintigraphy and why, and the study groups and the tests applied to them need to be defined more precisely. The workflow where the work is done should be more clearly defined. The p values used in the demographic information section (Table 1-2) in the findings describe the result of which comparison? Although an imaging study was presented, no MRU or scintigraphy images were presented. Demonstrative case examples should be presented with their images and stories. The discussion seems too short and simple. The use of the MRU technique should be explained in more detail and different methodological studies on the subject should be compared with existing findings. MRU technique is a costly technique that is not available everywhere, and therefore it is difficult to replace it with



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

scintigraphy. This should be stated and discussed in the discussion.