

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 31230

Title: CT-guided catheter drainage with urokinase and ozone in management of empyema

Reviewer's code: 03010522

Reviewer's country: Russia

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-11-08 20:43

Date reviewed: 2016-12-14 16:55

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

Reviewed work seems relevant and has sufficient novelty. Selected authors approach is based on application drainage, urokinase and ozone, is interesting from a position of influence on different components of the pathogenesis of empyema. However, the authors poorly justified selection of applied ozone dose. In my opinion, the work of therapy are underrepresented in the literature. Required some correction of the text of the article in connection with the presence of a number of failed expressions and stylistic designs. Overall, the article after the removal of the comments may be recommended for publication.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 31230

Title: CT-guided catheter drainage with urokinase and ozone in management of empyema

Reviewer's code: 00233953

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-11-08 20:43

Date reviewed: 2016-12-16 00:23

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

Interesting data Comment #1: The authors should explain why some patient were treated with urokinase and ozone. How decided and why. Does this introduce a bias?

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 31230

Title: CT-guided catheter drainage with urokinase and ozone in management of empyema

Reviewer's code: 00503175

Reviewer's country: Croatia

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-11-08 20:43

Date reviewed: 2016-12-18 04:51

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

Article " CT-guided catheter drainage with urokinase and ozone in management of empyema" is according to my opinion, acceptable for publication. The only needed is minor revision about language. This article is worthwhile for publication.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 31230

Title: CT-guided catheter drainage with urokinase and ozone in management of empyema

Reviewer's code: 00289471

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-11-08 20:43

Date reviewed: 2016-12-27 00:10

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 article is good. There are some minor language imperfections. Methods are not clear: how patients were selected? how the authors decided to treat with any of the three methods? I suppose that the more complicated cases were treated more aggressively. why diabetic patients were not treated? they were excluded from the study or were not treated at all? There were differences in the size of catheters used in the different groups? Pneumothorax does not seem to be in complicate though that the patients had a drainage. I think that after the authors clarify these aspects the article could be accepted.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 31230

Title: CT-guided catheter drainage with urokinase and ozone in management of empyema

Reviewer's code: 00289467

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-11-08 20:43

Date reviewed: 2016-12-28 04:49

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" 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 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

This paper might be interesting, as the use of ozone combined with urokinase in the management of empyema is unusual. However, in my opinion there are two limits that strongly weaken the value of the study. First, the authors administered intrapleural urokinase 50000 UI once just for one day: in all the most recent papers published on this topic urokinase was administered for at least three days, so it is likely that fibrinolytic treatment has been underdosed in this paper. Second, and most important, if group II (urokinase alone, 24 successful treatments and 8 failures) and group III (urokinase + ozone, 36 successful treatments and 5 failures) are directly compared with chi-square test excluding the group treated with only pleural drainage, there is no difference between the two groups ($p = 0.267$): it follows that it is hard to conclude that urokinase plus ozone is more effective than urokinase alone. The authors should deeply change their discussion and conclusions accordingly