# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Psychiatry
**Manuscript NO:** 35936
**Title:** Repeatability of 2D Chemical Shift Imaging Multivoxel Proton Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopy for Measuring Human Cerebral Choline-Containing Compounds
**Reviewer's code:** 02445209
**Reviewer's country:** Czech Republic
**Science editor:** Jin-Xin Kong
**Date sent for review:** 2017-10-02
**Date reviewed:** 2017-10-05
**Review time:** 2 Days

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|---|---|---|---|
| [ Y] Grade A: Excellent | [ Y] Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | [  ] Accept |
| [  ] Grade B: Very good | [  ] Grade B: Minor language polishing | [  ] The same title | [ Y] High priority for publication |
| [  ] Grade C: Good | [  ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | [  ] Duplicate publication | [  ] Rejection |
| [  ] Grade D: Fair | [  ] Grade D: Rejected | [  ] Plagiarism | [  ] Minor revision |
| [  ] Grade E: Poor | | [ Y] No | [  ] Major revision |
| | | BPG Search: | |
| | | [  ] The same title | |
| | | [  ] Duplicate publication | |
| | | [  ] Plagiarism | |
| | | [ Y] No | |

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, I only have a few comments on your manuscript, which is otherwise excellent: - The last paragraph of Discussion: You use the term "bleeding" in the neurospectroscopy data acquisition. Would you explain this in more detail to a reader? - Conclusion: Would you suggest more specific areas in psychiatric clinical practice, where the described technique could be applied (in which diseases, whether in diagnostics, treatment, prevention etc.)? - Table 1 and Table 2 are too extensive, is it not possible to make it shorter? Best regards The reviewer

# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Psychiatry
**Manuscript NO:** 35936
**Title:** Repeatability of 2D Chemical Shift Imaging Multivoxel Proton Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopy for Measuring Human Cerebral Choline-Containing Compounds
**Reviewer's code:** 00646357
**Reviewer's country:** Egypt
**Science editor:** Jin-Xin Kong
**Date sent for review:** 2017-10-30
**Date reviewed:** 2017-11-02
**Review time:** 3 Days

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|---|---|---|---|
| [ ] Grade A: Excellent | [ ] Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | [ ] Accept |
| [ ] Grade B: Very good | [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing | [ ] The same title | [ ] High priority for publication |
| [Y] Grade C: Good | | [ ] Duplicate publication | |
| [ ] Grade D: Fair | [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | [ ] Plagiarism | [ ] Rejection |
| [ ] Grade E: Poor | | [Y] No | [ ] Minor revision |
| | [ ] Grade D: Rejected | BPG Search: | [Y] Major revision |
| | | [ ] The same title | |
| | | [ ] Duplicate publication | |
| | | [ ] Plagiarism | |
| | | [Y] No | |

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

-Add about other methods of analysis of chemical shift imaging -More about choline and its clinical value -More about analysis, one slide or more, who do analysis, one or more and their experience and inter-observer analysis. -Update of references