ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology
ESPS manuscript NO: 9919
Title: The Role of fMRI in the Development and Refinement of DBS for Neuropsychiatric Disorders
Reviewer code: 00685045
Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen
Date sent for review: 2014-03-04 20:12
Date reviewed: 2014-03-17 02:05

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Existing	[ ] High priority for
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of	[ ] No records	publication
[ ] Grade D: Fair	language polishing	BPG Search:	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade E: Poor	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Existing	[Y] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[ ] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this review the authors summarize results from studies that used neuroimaging techniques to examine effects of deep brain stimulation.   I have the following comments/recommendations.   1. The title is not representative of the scope of the paper as fMRI is only one of the techniques included in the review.   Please revise. 2. I believe a table that summarizes advantages, disadvantages and cautions for each imaging method would be really helpful for the reader. 3. In the section for neuropsychiatric disease and their DBS targets, I was looking to find imaging results for each sub section.   Upon reading further in subsequent sections, I found that information.   My suggestion would be to include a brief description on how the review is structured in the introduction identifying what is covered in each section. 4. YBOCS or Y-BOCS scores are mentioned.   Please include what it stands for and as they are mentioned in several instances perhaps briefly describe what this test measures. 5. There are many abbreviations in this manuscript.   The authors have made considerable effort to identify these abbreviations, however, there are a several instances where what is abbreviated is not clear and sometimes not specified.   (e.g., MD thalamus is first mentioned on page 14, what does MD stand for; Ventromedial prefrontal cortex is sometimes referred to as VMPFC and others as vmPFC. It needs to be consistent; WM projections on page 20, what does WM stand for?). Perhaps in the instance of WM, which is only used once, the abbreviation can be eliminated.   I recommend abbreviations be spelled out in the first instance they are mentioned and

minimized when possible.   6. A recent meta-analysis presents an account of fMRI data on the different functions of the basal ganglia (Arsalidou, Duerden & Taylor, 2013).   Could you comment on how the data relate with DBS imaging findings? 7. Figures should be improved. Why are Word Processing panels visible on the figures? Also please include figure descriptions so that reader can navigate the figure independently (i.e., identify abbreviations).   Minor comments 8. I don't understand the use of square brackets in the first paragraph of introduction.   9. Page 5: Typo "… cannot be contextualized with a study than uses". Should it be "that uses"? 10. Page 14: Type " studies have confimed…" should be confirmed?

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology
ESPS manuscript NO: 9919
Title: The Role of fMRI in the Development and Refinement of DBS for Neuropsychiatric Disorders
Reviewer code: 00646583
Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen
Date sent for review: 2014-03-04 20:12
Date reviewed: 2014-04-11 20:15

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Existing	[ ] High priority for
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of	[ ] No records	publication
[ ] Grade D: Fair	language polishing	BPG Search:	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade E: Poor	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Existing	[Y] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[ ] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is an interesting review. However, although the title talks about fMRI and DBS, the text discusses other methods of exploring function in the brain. Indeed, authors talk about cortical stimulation which is not exactly the same that DBS. Therefore, we suggest to change the title. On the other hand, we consider the review too long and suggest to sum it up.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 9919

Title: The Role of fMRI in the Development and Refinement of DBS for Neuropsychiatric Disorders

Reviewer code: 02673247

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-03-04 20:12

Date reviewed: 2014-04-23 23:39

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[Y] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Existing	[Y] High priority for
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of	[ ] No records	publication
[ ] Grade D: Fair	language polishing	BPG Search:	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade E: Poor	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Existing	[ ] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[ ] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Deep brain stimulation (DBS) is emerging as a powerful tool for the alleviation of targeted symptoms in treatment-resistant neuropsychiatric disorders. This excellent review adresses the role of PET and fMRI in the Development and Refinement of DBS for Neuropsychiatric Disorders. However, the title of the review only relates to fMRI. Therefore,the title of the review should be changed into "The Role of PET and fMRI in the Development and Refinement of DBS for Neuropsychiatric Disorders."

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology
ESPS manuscript NO: 9919
Title: The Role of fMRI in the Development and Refinement of DBS for Neuropsychiatric Disorders
Reviewer code: 00225335
Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen
Date sent for review: 2014-03-04 20:12
Date reviewed: 2014-04-24 21:10

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[Y] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Existing	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	
[ ] Grade D: Fair		BPG Search:	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade E: Poor	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Existing	[ ] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[ ] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Overall, this is a well-written review article. The paper is acceptable for publication at its current format. Just one minor comment, Page 23, suggest changing "conclusion" to "summary and future directions".