



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: 27776

Title: Gastric blunt traumatic injuries: A computed tomography grading classification

Reviewer's code: 02348457

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-07-16 08:45

Date reviewed: 2016-08-10 16:15

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

1. The diagnosis of gastric injury was based on surgical findings in 22 patients, whereas for 10 patients the diagnosis was based on clinical and radiological findings. CT scan was performed in all patients. What is the final diagnosis of these 10 patients and what grades are according to the classification system provided? 2. The diagnosis of gastric injury was based on surgical findings in 22 patients, whereas for 10 patients the diagnosis was based on clinical and radiological findings. CT scan was performed in all patients. As CT scanners were variable, the authors should clarify on which phase of contrast enhancement and on which criteria each imaging sign was assessed.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27776

Title: Gastric blunt traumatic injuries: A computed tomography grading classification

Reviewer's code: 02577402

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-07-16 08:45

Date reviewed: 2016-08-02 18:55

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 type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	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

The authors investigated gastric blunt traumatic injuries about CT classification. Some problems existed. 1. The language needs to be improved because of some grammar mistakes. 2. For such a classification of the CT imaging of gastric blunt traumatic injuries, the number of 32 patients is a little too few. More patients need to be involved for a better classification of the gastric blunt injury classification. However, this paper gave the first initial try in this aspect and had some values. 3. Abstract: For an original research article, the abstract should be structural with Purpose, Materials and methods, Results and Conclusion. Please revise the abstract according to some already published research article. 4. Figures: There are some figures in the article. However, no citation of these figures was shown in the article. The citation of the figures were shown in the Table 4. This is not good. It is better to cite in the results as well. 5. Tables: For Table 1, there are more than 32 CT signs in the table and some patients may have more than one sign. It is better to point out which patients have one or over one signs. For Table 2, there are actually 33 abdominal associated lesions rather than 32 in 27 patients. Please check.



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: 27776

Title: Gastric blunt traumatic injuries: A computed tomography grading classification

Reviewer's code: 02669684

Reviewer's country: Egypt

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-07-16 08:45

Date reviewed: 2016-07-23 22:48

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" 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 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

Work is good, well designed. Results is accepted.