

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6057

Title: Contrast Enhanced Ultrasound (CEUS) with Quantitative Perfusion Analysis for Objective Characterization of Pancreatic Ductal Adenocarcinoma: feasibility study.

Reviewer code: 00058381

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2013-10-01 19:36

Date reviewed: 2013-10-21 01:34

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Major Comment: Although comprising only 10 patients and only tumors above 2.5cm in size, this is an interesting manuscript. Minor Comments: Were any patients excluded from the study (e.g. patients with cardiac risk factors)? Discussion: "CTP" - please write out this abbreviation. Please mention the figures within the text. Linguistic/stylistic problems.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6057

Title: Contrast Enhanced Ultrasound (CEUS) with Quantitative Perfusion Analysis for Objective Characterization of Pancreatic Ductal Adenocarcinoma: feasibility study.

Reviewer code: 00289583

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2013-10-01 19:36

Date reviewed: 2013-11-15 04:55

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

"The authors studied CEUS quantitative perfusion analysis for pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. The results are promising. However, I have some comments on the study design and data presented. 1. How were the patients selected for this study? Were tumor location and size the only consideration? 2. The averaged results does not represent the results from each case. How does CEUS quantitative perfusion analysis work for each of the ten patients? This study has small amount of cases, so data from each of the 10 patients studied can provide more information. 3. Is the result correlated with tumor location and sizes? Is there a minimum or maximum limit for the tumor size that can be studied with this method? 4. For diagnosis purpose, is there data from normal people? 5. Does the ROI location in parenchyma affect the conclusion? How does the measurement variation affect the results? Without the error study, I would doubt the validation of the proposed diagnosis method. 6. Where in the manuscript you refer to the figure? 7. The two figures were not labeled correctly. Are they both Fig 1? Where do I find "ROI in a" or "ROI in b"? Without the questions answered and data added, I would not be able to judge the validation of the study."

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6057

Title: Contrast Enhanced Ultrasound (CEUS) with Quantitative Perfusion Analysis for Objective Characterization of Pancreatic Ductal Adenocarcinoma: feasibility study.

Reviewer code: 00289467

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2013-10-01 19:36

Date reviewed: 2013-11-19 20:58

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Although the sample size is limited, the topic and results of this feasibility study are quite interesting and innovatory. However, I have some concern about the study design, as the authors do not specify the type of software used to analyze the time-intensity curve. It is not clear if linear raw data (or linearised log-compressed data) were analyzed, or just logarithmically compressed data were used to analyze the time-intensity curve. This fact strongly limits the actual value of the study, as it is known that performing a linear mathematical operation on compressed data leads to major error. Therefore, it is paramount that the authors clarify the type of analysis they performed. Abstract, Introduction, Results, and Discussion would be OK (with some language polishing), if linear data were analyzed.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6057

Title: Contrast Enhanced Ultrasound (CEUS) with Quantitative Perfusion Analysis for Objective Characterization of Pancreatic Ductal Adenocarcinoma: feasibility study.

Reviewer code: 00289440

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2013-10-01 19:36

Date reviewed: 2013-11-24 16:30

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear editorial According to manuscript number 6057, entitled as: "Contrast Enhanced Ultrasound (CEUS) with Quantitative Perfusion Analysis for Objective Characterization of Pancreatic Ductal Adenocarcinoma: feasibility study." General comments: This is a novel and practical study with a good writing and English language. In The discussion part, we need more comparison of the study with perfusion ct scan and MRI.