

BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wignet.com http://www.wignet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 16195

Title: Diagnosis of neuroendocrine carcinoma of the prostate: two cases report and

Literature Review

Reviewer's code: 02520360

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-01-07 21:45

Date reviewed: 2015-03-05 07:08

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[] Grade B: Very good	[] Grade B: Minor language	[] The same title	[] High priority for
[Y] Grade C: Good	polishing	[] Duplicate publication	publication
[] Grade D: Fair	[] Grade C: A great deal of	[] Plagiarism	[] Rejection
[] Grade E: Poor	language polishing	[Y] No	[] Minor revision
	[] Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	[] Major revision
		[] The same title	
		[] Duplicate publication	
		[] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Concise review of imaging and pathological findings of neuroendocrine prostate cancer.



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: 16195

Title: Diagnosis of neuroendocrine carcinoma of the prostate: two cases report and

Literature Review

Reviewer's code: 02831834 Reviewer's country: China Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-01-07 21:45

Date reviewed: 2015-02-01 15:10

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[] Grade A: Excellent	[] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[] Accept
[] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language	[] The same title	[Y] High priority for
[Y] Grade C: Good	polishing	[] Duplicate publication	publication
[] Grade D: Fair	[] Grade C: A great deal of	[] Plagiarism	[] Rejection
[] Grade E: Poor	language polishing	[Y] No	[] Minor revision
	[] Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	[] Major revision
		[] The same title	
		[] Duplicate publication	
		[] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. There is no MRI images for case two. How to differentiate PNEC from PC? 2. The conclusion part of Discussion should be concise. 3. Have you perform dynamic contrast-enhanced MRI for these two cases? What was it like in venous phase?