

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Methodology

ESPS manuscript NO: 29841

Title: Automated calculation of evidence-based clinical scores

Reviewer's code: 00068723

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-08-29 22:41

Date reviewed: 2016-10-13 16:51

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

The authors investigated scoring systems of evidence for clinical application. The aim was clear and results were useful. Not many readers may be familiar with modified Delphi methodology. It was hard to obtain the whole picture of the study. It would be helpful to add introduction of Delphi methodology in Introduction. It was not clear how the authors performed the present study. Figures would present the procedures of scoring more clearly and easily to understand.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Methodology

ESPS manuscript NO: 29841

Title: Automated calculation of evidence-based clinical scores

Reviewer's code: 00477662

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-08-29 22:41

Date reviewed: 2016-10-18 21:12

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"/> 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

The paper is of interest and well written.