



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: 22617

Title: Preoperative embolization of primary bone tumors: A case control study

Reviewer's code: 02695138

Reviewer's country: Croatia

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-09-12 10:23

Date reviewed: 2015-09-16 02:55

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> 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

1. In Table 1 in Control group Number and percentage are missing 2. Title should be more descriptive.



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 22617

Title: Preoperative embolization of primary bone tumors: A case control study

Reviewer’s code: 03068027

Reviewer’s country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-09-12 10:23

Date reviewed: 2015-09-25 05:20

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 type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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

In fact this is an interesting study regarding the importance of preoperative embolization of primary bone tumors. The overall structure of the manuscript is complete according to the journal’s requirements and also the topic falls within the scope of the journal. Furthermore, the language grading is A. On the other hand I would like to make the following comments: 1. Considering the way the control group was recruited (retrospectively from records) this is better described as a case control study. 2. The type, grade and staging of the tumor are important characteristics that affect its “bleeding potential” and type of operation. In your study you examine the effectiveness of preoperative embolization in 2 groups with at least 3 different type of tumors or tumour like lesions, unknown staging and grading and different locations. I believe that in order to extract safer conclusions the two groups should be more homogeneous: i.e, ABC in extremities same grade and same type of operation. Otherwise different tumors in different sites treated with different types of operation have different potential for bleeding. Therefore in my opinion the above research should be reorganized and represented according to the comments.



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: 22617

Title: Preoperative embolization of primary bone tumors: A case control study

Reviewer's code: 02699853

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-09-12 10:23

Date reviewed: 2015-09-28 18:52

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 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 checked="" 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

Please, keep the introduction on to present the current state of the topic. Avoid te historical references. Which were exclusion criteria? Were the patients of the control group matched to those of study group only for the diagnosis? That could be an important bias in relation to the achieved results. There was any difference between the results of patients with a > 75% reduction of tumor blush and those with a reduction 50-75%? There was any difference between the result of patients embolized using the combination gelfoam-PVA and those embolized using PVA only? Please, add a table comparing your results with those of other authors from the reports of the literature.