# ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15629

**Title:** Perfusion CT In Renal Cell Carcinoma

**Reviewer's code:** 00058381

**Reviewer's country:** Austria

**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian

**Date sent for review:** 2014-12-02 16:43

**Date reviewed:** 2014-12-16 03:50

| 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 | [  ] 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 | [Y] Minor revision |
| | [  ] Grade D: Rejected | BPG Search: | [  ] Major revision |
| | | [  ] The same title | |
| | | [  ] Duplicate publication | |
| | | [  ] Plagiarism | |
| | | [Y ] No | |

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Major comment: This manuscript deals with the role of perfusion CT in staging and treatment-response assessment of patients with renal cell carcinoma. It presents results of an "ongoing study"; nevertheless, I found it interesting to read.   Minor comments: Section "Perfusion CT: Technique"/"Our Institutional Protocol", first sentence: The correct name of this town is "Erlangen" (instead of "Erlanger") Please use consistent spelling for "tumor/tumour" Many spaces are missing (e.g. "anyactual", "describesthe"...). Please write out abbreviated terms on first use ("MIP", "ROI")

# ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Radiology
**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15629
**Title:** Perfusion CT in Renal Cell Carcinoma
**Reviewer's code:** 00227360
**Reviewer's country:** China
**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian
**Date sent for review:** 2014-12-02 16:43
**Date reviewed:** 2015-01-19 13:20

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|---|---|---|---|
| [ ] Grade A: Excellent | [ Y] Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | [ ] 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: | [ Y] Major revision |
| | | [ ] The same title | |
| | | [ ] Duplicate publication | |
| | | [ ] Plagiarism | |
| | | [Y ] No | |

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This pictorial review describes the techniques and role of perfusion CT in staging and response assessment in patients with RCCs. However, there are some main drawbacks in the article that hinder its immediate publication by the WJR. - the content in term of CT perfusion is not really state-of-the-art, as many advanced techniques are not included, such as histogram analysis. - The references cited by the manuscript are too old, and most recent articles should be reviewed and covered. - As a pictorial review, the figures are not sufficient to demonstrate the topic.

# ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Radiology
**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15629
**Title:** Perfusion CT in RENAL Cell Carcinoma
**Reviewer's code:** 00227565
**Reviewer's country:** Egypt
**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian
**Date sent for review:** 2014-12-02 16:43
**Date reviewed:** 2015-01-17 13:14

| 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 | [ ] 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: | [Y] Major revision |
| | | [ ] The same title | |
| | | [ ] Duplicate publication | |
| | | [ ] Plagiarism | |
| | | [Y ] No | |

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Author The topic is perfectly chosen. However, the construction is misleading. You are mixing the facts of a revision paper with the work in progress you are running. Also, the salient feature of your article is the out dated references. If you did a pubmed search on related topics you will find a flow of new articles in last 5 years!! Your figures are good but it will be interesting for a reading junior radiologist looking for updating his knowledge is to learn how to read these images and extract its data…even briefly. Also, I labeled many comments at their appropriate setting in the attached Pdf format as it lacks line labels. This critical review may help you to improve your work. Good luck Reviewer