

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 22131

Title: Quantitative study of prostate cancer using 3D fiber tractography

Reviewer's code: 02977114

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-08-16 08:10

Date reviewed: 2015-09-03 23:48

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 checked="" 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"/> 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 checked="" 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 article on an interesting topic. The symbols in Appendix 1 did not come out in the Word document, though, so please fix that. Also HIPAA is misspelled as HIPPA, and cellularity is also misspelled in the comments. Otherwise, worthy of publication in this journal.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 22131

Title: Quantitative study of prostate cancer using 3D fiber tractography

Reviewer's code: 02346872

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-08-16 08:10

Date reviewed: 2015-10-01 10:43

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] 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"/> [Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade E: Poor		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"/> [Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Title: The main and short title accurately reflects the major topic and content of the study. Abstract: The abstract present the innovative and significant points related to the background, objectives, materials and methods, results, and conclusions. Materials and Methods: The materials and methods sufficiently described for the results and conclusions that are presented in the preceding sections. Results: The results provide sufficient data to draw firm scientific conclusions. Discussion: The conclusions are drawn appropriately supported by the literature. References: The references are appropriate, relevant, and up-to-date. Figures: The figures reflected the major findings of the study. Overall: This is an innovative and valuable study. This information may be useful in promoting the non-invasive diagnosis of prostate cancer.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 22131

Title: Quantitative study of prostate cancer using 3D fiber tractography

Reviewer's code: 02831834

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-08-16 08:10

Date reviewed: 2015-10-05 16:17

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input 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 study, three parameters were compared in in tumour region and normal tissue, including tract density, ADC and FA values. The results come out that tract density may offer new biomarker to distinguish tumour from normal tissue. 1.Since ADC values and tract density are all showed statistically differences. Which one is the more sensitive biomarker? 2. Have you ever compared benign prostatic nodules with prostate cancer? What's the results of benign prostatic nodules?

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 22131

Title: Quantitative study of prostate cancer using 3D fiber tractography

Reviewer's code: 02835073

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-08-16 08:10

Date reviewed: 2015-10-09 03:04

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"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" 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

your study is not interesting and is not good enough for publication

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 22131

Title: Quantitative study of prostate cancer using 3D fiber tractography

Reviewer's code: 02577402

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-08-16 08:10

Date reviewed: 2015-10-21 19:39

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"/> 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors investigated the 3D fiber tractography quantitatively of prostate cancer. Some problems existed. 1. Key words: Please delete 1.5 Tesla. Add Tract Density as a new key word. 2. Use of abbreviations: When first using an abbreviation, the full phrase should be given. For example, magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). Later you can always use the abbreviation without mentioning the full phrase. This is so in the abstract as well as in the text. In the text, you should also give the full phrase when using the abbreviation for the first time even if you have used the abbreviation in the abstract. The authors did not abide by this rule all the time. For example, MRI, DTI, PSA etc. Another example, the authors first gave the full phrase of DWI (diffusion weighted imaging) in the INTRODUCTION, but then in the MATERIALS AND METHODS part, the authors used the full phrase once again. Check the whole article and correct all similar problems. 3. RESULTS in the text: This part is too short without sufficient data. More over, the authors just gave the mean values without mentioning the range of the values like the age, the tumor size, the average radius, etc. Please give the range of the values of these parameters including the mean and the standard error of means. Give some more detailed data in this part. 4. DISCUSSION: This part is



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>

not sufficient. Please rewrite this part in the following order: first paragraph: restate your major findings. Second paragraph: compare your findings with those in the literature. 3rd para: state the clinical significance of your study, the specificity of your results, etc. 4th para: limitations of your study. 5th para: Conclusion: use one or two sentences to make a direct conclusion which should be directly relevant to your study. 5. Figures: In Fig1, please use some arrows to indicate the tract anatomy or the complex architecture. Abbreviations: Please give the full phrase of the abbreviations when first using them. 6. Tables: If possible, please use some tables to describe some of the data. 7. Title of the article: The title of the article is too broad. Please use some more specific expressions for the title to indicate the role of the 3D fiber tractography.