



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 11749

Title: Visualization of normal appendix on 128-slice MDCT: Evaluation of frequency and thickness of normal appendix in adult population.

Reviewer code: 00028194

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-06-03 21:35

Date reviewed: 2014-06-23 05:34

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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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

The paper is well written and describes the results well. The conclusions are well founded. The study adds to several others looking at the diameter of the normal appendix. These data are consistent with other reports on the normal appendix, as indicated by the authors. (The previous literature was well-documented.) However, the authors may also wish to examine a recent review of the appendix (Laurin, Everett and Parker, 2011: The Anatomical Record 294:567-579) which describes a number of additional studies regarding appendix size. The authors state several “weaknesses”, but these are in fact not weaknesses and are readily debunked by the authors. (The statements of limitations which are not actually limitations is not necessary.) One limitation to the study is evident: Why were the patients with a prior appendectomy excluded? Including these patients would have provided an excellent test of the radiologists’ ability to accurately find the appendix. (False positives would have been extremely telling.)