

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 23198

**Title:** Credentialing in radiology: Current practice and future challenges

**Reviewer's code:** 00225366

**Reviewer's country:** Canada

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-11-04 08:54

**Date reviewed:** 2015-11-05 03:41

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 a review article concerning the credentialing in Radiology. The author reviewed the current and future challenges in Radiology mainly focusing on the UK and the USA. I found the author is very knowledgeable to prepare this review with decent publications. The author also expressed his/her opinions regarding the development of credentialing in Radiology. I strongly suggest the author including some diagrams and tables in the article such as some statistics concerning the radiology development in different countries and tables of comparison in credentialing implementation among different countries.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 23198

**Title:** Credentialing in radiology: Current practice and future challenges

**Reviewer's code:** 00058381

**Reviewer's country:** Austria

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-11-04 08:54

**Date reviewed:** 2015-11-05 22:17

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 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 checked="" 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

Major Comment: Although mainly dealing with the situation in the UK and the US, this manuscript provides an interesting review on an important topic, including critical remarks and future perspectives. Minor Comments: Page 7, fourth paragraph: "The lack of clear aims and agreement on how credentialing would work in practice has lead to..." -> "...has led to..." Page 9: 'In our proposed approach to training, some specialty training and all subspecialty training will be acquired through credentialed programmes once doctors have completed their postgraduate training and doctors who are not in a formal training programme.' - This quotation does not sound grammatically correct, please check it. Page 10, second paragraph: "Although these proposals are still in there infancy,..." -> "Although these proposals are still in their infancy,..."

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 23198

**Title:** Credentialing in radiology: Current practice and future challenges

**Reviewer's code:** 00227360

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-11-04 08:54

**Date reviewed:** 2015-11-12 22:06

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 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	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this review article, the authors raise an interesting but commonly ignored topic: the credentialing in radiology and its current practice and future challenges. The relevant knowledge is benefit to all the physicians, radiologists and medical managers. It is suggested that a paragraph (or a table) is added to the manuscript to discuss all available credentialing items currently existing in radiology.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 23198

**Title:** Credentialing in radiology: Current practice and future challenges

**Reviewer's code:** 00289529

**Reviewer's country:** United Kingdom

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-11-04 08:54

**Date reviewed:** 2015-11-23 23:28

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 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 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

A helpful paper indicating and discussing an issue that is relevant to almost ALL medical specialties. The one of "taking a sub-specialty" I think the authors have put the problem on its right basis but their discussion, presentation and analysis is not satisfactory, as not giving suggestions therefore the present author cannot see what its publication would offer to readers