

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Radiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 8854

**Title:** MR Imaging of CNS infections in immunocompromised---a patterned approach

**Reviewer code:** 00504436

**Science editor:** Ling-Ling Wen

**Date sent for review:** 2014-01-11 14:30

**Date reviewed:** 2014-01-14 02:56

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"/> 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	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS** The review presents a simplified approach to CNS infections using advanced high resolution MR sequences that would help quick characterization of these infections. Minor remarks: ? The technical appearance of the manuscript should be improved in order to match adequate form for WJR (writing title, subtitles, pagination, justification, paragraphs space, etc.) ? Figures should also have uniform appearance, for example: Fig. 2-5, and Fig. 8 have no frame, while Fig. 6, 7, 9-12 have frame. In some Figures a, b, c marks are missing and in others these marks are written with, and sometimes without brackets. ? Identifications a, b, c in Figure 2 are missing. ? In Figure 1, 13, 19, 21, and 24 authors should avoid artistic look of the presented material. One could easily tell that Figure were made from previous Power Point presentations. In Journals such content should be presented in black and white with maximum attention to visibility (font, pt. size, text box size, etc.). New Figures should be made. ? Technical errors: writing number and unit together, omitting space after the dot or comma. Inadequate writing of bracket contents in MR Spectroscopy part. Some subtitles are written all in uppercase, while others are written in sentence case. ? Delete "Displayed as an educational exhibit in ECR2013" after Figs. 1-5. ? Pagination and number of text lines are missing. ? Use of abbreviations: insert explanations for FINAC, FLAIR, SW, etc. ? Some of the references are inadequate and some new should be added Major remarks: ? It is highly unusual that Introduction part of Review paper is consists of 4 paragraphs of text followed with 5 Figures. More textual explanation is needed between Figures. ? First cited reference is on the 4th page of the



## 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](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

manuscript which is also highly unusual. Introduction part should started with adequate background information and citation. ? There is a lack of explanation regarding “Multi-parametric” as well as “A Simplified Patterned” approach

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Radiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 8854

**Title:** MR Imaging of CNS infections in immunocompromised---a patterned approach

**Reviewer code:** 02446726

**Science editor:** Ling-Ling Wen

**Date sent for review:** 2014-01-11 14:30

**Date reviewed:** 2014-02-18 19:40

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	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is written in a clear and comprehensive manner. The authors focus on major findings and keep the manuscript short. Also, with the pictures included and the flowcharts provided, the manuscript is a welcome teaching compendium for both the interested clinician as well as the neuroradiologist in training. The manuscript merits publication as a short review, however it would greatly profit from addressing one major and multiple minor issues prior to publication. Major: The manuscript would greatly profit from the inclusion of images of potential differential diagnoses (i.e. neoplasms, lymphomas etc. for each and every section of the four basic types of lesions: ring enhancing lesions, basal ganglia space occupying lesions, grey matter hyperintensities, white matter hyperintensities). This would add to the usefulness of the review and would allow the reader to fully appreciate the difference in imaging representation of all differential diagnoses presented by the authors. In all sections the differential diagnosis of primary brain tumor should be discussed shortly and its exclusion for the list of differential diagnoses explained sufficiently. This should also be included in the flow charts at the end of each section. Minor: 1. Abbreviations should be preceded by full length explanations (i.e. FNAC page one, 1st paragraph, last but one line). This should be preceded by "fine- needle aspiration cytology"; other examples: 1.1. SW- imaging (page 4, 1st paragraph, 3rd line) (susceptibility weighted imaging) 1.2. Fluid attenuated inversion recovery (FLAIR): page 3, legend to figure 4, 1st line. 1.3. ADCs page 9, 1st paragraph, 2nd line etc. 2. The language used is sometimes too colloquial. The authors should refrain from using colloquial terms



## 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](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

(i.e. ... adding fuel to the fire; page 1, 1st paragraph, 3rd lane; and The "workhorse" ..., page 1, 2nd paragraph, 1st lane). These terms and other colloquial terms should be replaced by proper scientific terms. Figure 17: The authors should indicate the elevated peaks for lipid, lactate and choline in the spectroscopy provided. Figure 22: If the legend to the figure is correct, the authors mismatched the corresponding images! This needs clarification.

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Radiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 8854

**Title:** MR Imaging of CNS infections in immunocompromised---a patterned approach

**Reviewer code:** 00646265

**Science editor:** Ling-Ling Wen

**Date sent for review:** 2014-01-11 14:30

**Date reviewed:** 2014-02-23 18:14

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" 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	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript reviews the advanced MRI techniques helping in the differential diagnosis of CNS infections in immune-compromised patients. The review paper is interesting and clearly written in good English and there are many Figures (MRI images) and Flow Charts illustrating the points made by the authors. Minor points 1.A list of abbreviations used might be helpful for the general reader. There are some abbreviations needing clarification: ADC, FNAC, NAA, SW. 2.Page numbers are needed at least to locate possible mistakes. 2.Once an abbreviation is introduced it might be used always throughout the manuscript and not sometimes. 3.Use "encephalitis" instead of "encephalitis" 4.Fig 8 Legend: Change "matabolites" to "metabolites" 5.MRI Angiography: it might be better "Tubercular vasculitis results in extensive infarction due to inflammation of vessels coursing through the basal exudates". 6.It might be better: "...thus do not contribute to signal production." 7.Reference 6 might be modified including the publisher information: "Publisher: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; Third edition (January 15, 2002)".