

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 14762

Title: Improvement of distension and mural visualization of bowel loops using neutral oral contrasts in abdominal computed tomography

Reviewer code: 00289418

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2014-08-18 15:26

Date reviewed: 2014-08-23 21:34

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<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	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Review report for manuscript: WJG/20140817193721 (MS# 13327) Improvement of Distension and Mural Visualization of Bowel Loops Using Neutral Oral Contrasts in Abdominal CT

GENERAL COMMENTS This paper compares two different contrast agent approaches: neutral vs positive which is the routinely used one. The study is well designed and its results very interesting. However, the paper has a few points that need to be corrected, with most important being the interpretation of statistics given in Table 1 (see comment 17). I believe that the authors will make the necessary corrections prior to publication.

Abstract 1. Well written. It gives a full description of the study design and the results.

Introduction 2. The introduction is informative and very well written.

Materials and Methods 3. A subsection like "patient selection process" should be used before the first paragraph

4. The first paragraph should be re-written to clearly describe in an orderly fashion: patient inclusion criteria, patient exclusion criteria, patient grouping etc.

Study approval should be stated in the last sentence.

Bowel distending agent 5. Consider revising "They were observed closely by a trained nurse for occurring" with "They were observed closely by a trained nurse for the occurrence"

6. "... which was prepared using 60 gr sorbitol sugar mixed in 1500 ml of water. For sorbitol sugar, we used 12 sachet of sorbitol, each containing 6 gr of sorbitol". I do not understand it ; 12×6 gr=72 gr not 60.

7. Consider revising sentence to: "A 16-detector row CT scanner was used for all scans and modifications in the general abdominal scan protocol were minimal"

8.

"After obtaining coronal images". Do you mean scan projection radiographs (scanograms or topograms) 9. "120 ml of intravenous contrast material with concentration of 300 mg/ml iodine was administered by a power injector at rate of 3-4 ml/sec. Afterwards infusion of 50 ml of normal saline was performed with the same rate. At the end of the imaging, all cases were coded, identifiers were deleted, and the studies were maintained for further analysis." Is this the protocol for positive contrast agent only? Where is the protocol for the first group (neutral contrast agent group)? Data analysis 10. "Once all 200 scans". It is not 200 scans, it is 200 examinations. 11. visible [4] and perfect [4]. The [4] should be written as (4). Results 12. "were reported in the patients". Delete "in the patients" 13. Break the single paragraph in 2 smaller, e.g. 2nd could start "In Table 2..." 14. The mean duodenal, jejunal and ileal diameter reported by both radiologists is shown in (Table 1). In table 1 the quantitative score is given not the "diameter". 15. Table 1; Since the first group is the neutral is better to report results first of the neutral or switch the groups' numbering 16. Table 2: align satisfaction scores with respective headers. Also values in % are redundant since all numbers are already percentages (sample size=100) . Discussion 17. "Our study demonstrated that small bowel wall visualization is significantly improved by the usage of neutral contrast agent (sorbitol solution) especially for jejunum and ileum". Except if I have missed something here, Table 1 p values are statistically significant for Duodenum ($p < 0.1$ for radiologist 1 only), not statistical significant for ileum (however, they suggest that neutral may work better but the null hypothesis -both contrast agents are equivalent- is not rejected) and certainly for Jejunum both contrast agents seem equivalent. Test your statistics interpretation.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 14762

Title: Improvement of distension and mural visualization of bowel loops using neutral oral contrasts in abdominal computed tomography

Reviewer code: 00227565

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2014-08-18 15:26

Date reviewed: 2014-08-29 14:52

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<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 type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Author I passed through your manuscript as I get taken by its title. Unfortunately, I lost my interest in it as I moved from one sentence to the next. Yet as a colleague I would to accept my comments on your work. I think you have to consider it as an advice rather than criticism aiming to improve your manuscript. Comments: ? Poor English is the eminent feature of this manuscript. ? It seems it did not get any revision. The phrasing is inappropriate and misleading in most sections. ? The introduction is too lengthy for a scientific paper...it could fit with a review or meta-analysis types of manuscripts. ? Aim of work listed in the abstract is largely non-coherent with that of the manuscript. In methods section: ? The first sentence is vague and does not make sense. ? Also, it is not clear the number of your patient's population, their sex stratification ? What do you mean by 1% DI solution? In results section ? What do you mean by image quality satisfaction? Which parameters were used to judge? Where are the summary results of your statistical works (I mean the appropriate statistical values in right place, not just in tables?) ? The Discussion section needs to be reconsidered after dealing with the above points. I hope these comments to be of help for you to improve your manuscript. Regards, Reviewer.