

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 9826

Title: Measuring consciousness in coma and related disorders

Reviewer code: 02445261

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-03-02 18:42

Date reviewed: 2014-03-13 01:14

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is, in summary, a comprehensive overview about the contribution of neuroimaging techniques in assessing patients with different disorders of consciousness. The manuscript is interesting and well-written, therefore only minor changes are needed in my opinion to the current version of the paper as presented. The authors may find as follows my comments/suggestions. First, I suggest to specify in the main objectives of the study (page 4, lines 17-21) that the authors reviewed the current literature also about the contribution of structural neuroimaging studies and disorders of consciousness as reported later throughout the main text. Here, they only reported that they mainly focused on the contribution of functional neuroimaging studies in improving the current knowledge of disorders of consciousness. Then, I suggest to add a specific section describing the main methods of the present study as currently it's quite unknown what databases the authors used to perform their timely critical review about the reported topic, what papers have been screened and selected for the inclusion in the present study, which key words have been used, what is the period in which the search has been carried out, etc. Furthermore, the sections regarding clinical entities of disorders of consciousness and the most important neuroimaging studies in disorders of consciousness are really too long and need to be reduced in length. I suggest to include one or two Tables in order to summarize all the relevant information that have been reported by the authors. Also, a specific section at the end of the manuscript (before the Conclusion section) is presumably requested in order to inform the general readership about the major shortcomings concerning the application of the mentioned methodologies in the study of different disorders of consciousness. After including these minor changes, I recommend this valuable manuscript for publication.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 9826

Title: Measuring consciousness in coma and related disorders

Reviewer code: 02793333

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-03-02 18:42

Date reviewed: 2014-03-14 07:37

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"/> 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"/> [Y]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

The aim of the review is contemporary and interesting. The Sentence: Consciousness is thought to represent an emergent property of cortical and subcortical neural networks and their reciprocal projections. is 100% taken from other works, at least not properly quoted. The paper should be properly written with own words or proper citations.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 9826

Title: Measuring consciousness in coma and related disorders

Reviewer code: 02687760

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-03-02 18:42

Date reviewed: 2014-03-27 23:37

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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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

This is a well-written, interesting, and timely article. The authors do a commendable job of describing the various techniques and seem to give each study a similar level of detail/review. I have two minor suggestions: (1) Please carefully review the text for typographical errors as well as errors in syntax. There were more than a handful present. (2) Consider adding a subsection entitled "Methods" or similar. Because this is a review, the reader should be able to see how the articles were chosen (eg, keyword searches, databases, dates), how many were excluded from consideration, and if there was some sort of decision-tree or other tool (eg, group consensus) used to systematically makes decisions regarding inclusion/exclusion. Otherwise, this paper stands to make a nice contribution to the literature.