

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 30764

Title: Chronic antiepileptic drug use and functional network efficiency: A functional magnetic resonance imaging study

Reviewer's code: 02548806

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-10-19 15:38

Date reviewed: 2016-12-14 02:32

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"/> 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

A well written good structured manuscript which summarizes the findings clearly. Could the authors add a figure showing the functional impairment areas and describe the resultant functional affects? (Like a figure in a previously published literature "https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4490704/figure/f3/") (or at least add a table describing these)

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 30764

Title: Chronic antiepileptic drug use and functional network efficiency: A functional magnetic resonance imaging study

Reviewer's code: 00646433

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-10-19 15:38

Date reviewed: 2016-12-20 18:09

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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"/> 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

This study aims at testing whether functional resting-state network measures are associated with impaired cognitive functioning. ? The study is well conducted and well written. Graphs and table are clear and informative. I would only make clear and consistent throughout the manuscript that patients on topiramate are four. This is of relevance since different group numerosity is one of the limitation of the study.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 30764

Title: Chronic antiepileptic drug use and functional network efficiency: A functional magnetic resonance imaging study

Reviewer's code: 00214317

Reviewer's country: Egypt

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-10-19 15:38

Date reviewed: 2016-11-16 13:52

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 writtern and needs minor corrections