

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Respiriology

ESPS manuscript NO: 29959

Title: Phenotyping emphysema and airways disease: Clinical value of quantitative radiological techniques

Reviewer's code: 03491997

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-09-05 10:38

Date reviewed: 2016-10-18 16:49

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 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"/> 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input 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

This is a very well done review about the use of different imaging techniques in the phenotyping of emphysema. Differently from other review published on the same issue, authors focused also on nuclear imaging. I would suggest only minor discretionary changes: - what about the use of OCT in airways disease? Is there a role in phenotyping emphysema? Is it possible to add a paragraph on this issue?

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Respiriology

ESPS manuscript NO: 29959

Title: Phenotyping emphysema and airways disease: Clinical value of quantitative radiological techniques

Reviewer's code: 03495214

Reviewer's country: Sweden

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-09-05 10:38

Date reviewed: 2016-10-28 11:16

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 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"/> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input 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

1. please specify how long did the procedure last 2. did you use preoperative antibiotics and which? 3. please clarify more in details which was the post-op course of the patient, and in particular: - when was the patient extubated - which antibiotic was used and for how long - which was the course of bowel movements - when was the patient allowed liquid and solid diet - if the patient had fever and for how long

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Respiriology

ESPS manuscript NO: 29959

Title: Phenotyping emphysema and airways disease: Clinical value of quantitative radiological techniques

Reviewer's code: 03489923

Reviewer's country: Denmark

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-09-05 10:38

Date reviewed: 2016-10-31 09:44

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"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input 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

this is a very comprehensive and interesting review Main concern is its lenght and the number of figures. Perhaps some of that could be in an online supplement