

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 30716

Title: Imaging spectrum of spinal dysraphism on magnetic resonance: A pictorial review

Reviewer's code: 00477662

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-10-17 13:40

Date reviewed: 2016-12-12 15:28

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 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"/> 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

I would recommend the authors to modify some of the images and have all of them in gray scale.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 30716

Title: Imaging spectrum of spinal dysraphism on magnetic resonance: A pictorial review

Reviewer's code: 02635498

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-10-17 13:40

Date reviewed: 2016-10-24 17:16

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"/> 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

I was pleased to review the article `Imaging spectrum of spinal dysraphism : A pictorial review`. The authors presented a review article that comprehensively review the normal development of spinal cord and MR imaging features of spinal dysraphism with clinico-embryologic and radiological correlation. Firstly, this is a well-written and well-designed manuscript except presented illustrative and some radiologic images. I think the authors must replace the illustrative images with the high quality new ones. I am curious these illustrative images are the authors own images or they are taken from another article or book (If yes, the authors must present citation at the end of the each figures and receive informed permission from the publisher). Some of the radiologic images are also in low quality. Please replace these images with high quality digital forms and please make all of the figures in gray scale. Minor issues: 1. In introduction section: Caudal agenesis presented in both defects during secondary neurulation and defective development of notochord groups? It is not clear, can both condition cause same pathology? 2. In classification section:we will follow the.... Could be more suitable. 3. "CSDS WITHOUT SUBCUTANEOUS MASS" to "CSDs WITHOUT SUBCUTANEOUS MASS".