

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 21760

**Title:** Amyloid positron emission tomography and cognitive reserve

**Reviewer's code:** 03375888

**Reviewer's country:** India

**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian

**Date sent for review:** 2015-07-29 17:41

**Date reviewed:** 2015-08-03 15:06

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting area of research with huge clinical application potential. The manuscript will be strengthened with any guidance to current or future application with regard to available models including quantitative data for those models.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 21760

**Title:** Amyloid positron emission tomography and cognitive reserve

**Reviewer's code:** 02510166

**Reviewer's country:** Martinique

**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian

**Date sent for review:** 2015-07-29 17:41

**Date reviewed:** 2015-07-30 03:22

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<input checked="" 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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Well written, good narrative review. Some quantitative information would be welcome, such as incidence or prevalence of AD, validation data of AmyPET. It might be useful to mention whether PET is recommended or is considered investigational in the workup of AD. Minor typo's: Abstract: define abbreviations A $\beta$ , CSF. Text: age onset -> age of onset. "frame" or "Framework"? Check dictionary definitions of frame and framework, "framework" would be more appropriate. Contribute of ... --> contribution of ... Page 6: "and fMRI" --> a fMRI. page 7: pAD: define. page 12: Accordingly is still a... -> accordingly it is still a...