

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 23436

Title: Contrast enhanced ultrasound improved performance of breast imaging reporting and data system evaluation of critical breast lesions

Reviewer's code: 00214317

Reviewer's country: Egypt

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2015-11-19 19:28

Date reviewed: 2016-01-19 13:56

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is well written but need to do interobserver agreement of both readers to improve the result

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 23436

Title: Contrast enhanced ultrasound improved performance of breast imaging reporting and data system evaluation of critical breast lesions

Reviewer's code: 00289451

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2015-11-19 19:28

Date reviewed: 2016-01-20 01:49

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"/> 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"/> 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"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The submitted work aims to determine whether contrast enhanced ultrasound can improve the risk stratification provided by BI-RADS categorization to reduce false-positive biopsy rates among patients with critical breast lesions. The results concern 230 patients and further investigations are needed. Nevertheless, the conclusions and statistical check confirm the finale statements. The false positive induce world wide unacceptable high rate of biopsies and CEUS could offer for sure a better identification of related risk and tissue characterization.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 23436

Title: Contrast enhanced ultrasound improved performance of breast imaging reporting and data system evaluation of critical breast lesions

Reviewer's code: 03366101

Reviewer's country: Brazil

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2015-11-19 19:28

Date reviewed: 2015-11-24 04:56

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 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 checked="" 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		<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 high number of false positives is a significant problem in breast imaging. The CEUS may play an important role in this matter. However the manuscript still requires some adjustment.