



## **ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Radiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25627

**Title:** Peripheral Nerve Imaging: not only cross-sectional area

**Reviewer's code:** 02577402

### **COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

In this editorial, the author discussed the peripheral nerve imaging which is not just cross-sectional area. Some problems existed.

1. Use of abbreviations: When first using an abbreviation, you should give the full phrase. For example, ultrasound (US). Later, you can always use the abbreviation US without mentioning the full phrase. However, the authors did not abide by this rule all the time. In the text, the authors first used "magnetic resonance (MR) imaging" in line 4 in the first paragraph. Then, the author used MRI in line 6 without giving the full phrase of this abbreviation. Later, in line 9 in the second paragraph, the author used "magnetic resonance imaging (MRI)". This is not good. Other examples: ultrasound (US). The author gave the definition of US in line 3 in the first paragraph. Later, the author should use only US to indicate ultrasound. However, the author used ultrasound again and again and again. No good at all. If an abbreviation is used only once, there is no need to use the above role and no need to use the abbreviation. You can just use the full phrase. In this case, do not use an abbreviation. However, the author used several words like this. For example, ESSR. No need to give the abbreviation because it was used only once. Another example, ISPNI, also only once. Please check the whole article and revise similar problems.

**- Thank you for the comment. We reviewed the abbreviations, as requested.**

2. For an editorial, it is difficult to review because I am not sure what the author wanted to do. Usually, it is to recommend an article with advanced technique or introduction to new skills or similar purpose. For this article, it seems that the author tried to argue in favor of ultrasound rather than MRI.

**- Thank you for the comment. The goal was to state that US is a possible quantitative imaging biomarker technique for peripheral nerves evaluation. Therefore US is not only used to simply calculate nerve cross-sectional area.**



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

3. Citation: In the second paragraph, the author used some specific data like numbers and means to indicate the FR. However, no direct citation followed these data. This is not good. Please give the citation immediately after the use of the data. The conclusion is the end of an article. In this part, no citation should be present. In the conclusion, please use only one or two sentences to indicate directly what conclusion you have drawn based on your arguments. However, the author used a lot of citations in the conclusion even to induce some new ideas. This is no good. If you have not finished your arguments, please do not draw the conclusion. After you have done your argument, it is time for you to reach a conclusion with only one or two sentences. Please revise this part.

4. References For an editorial, the references should limit to only a few references like 8 or 10. In this editorial, the author used 24 references! Too many! Please revise the relevant information.

**- We reviewed the phrases and the references. Regarding the number of references, please note that in the invitation that was sent for this Editorial "there are no restrictions on the number of words, figures (color, B/W) or authors for this invited submission.....". As a general rule, I agree that the number of references could be considered high, but for this paper in WJR it could be considered acceptable. WJR sent me an example of an editorial with more than 50 References.**



**BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC**

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

## **ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Radiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25627

**Title:** Peripheral Nerve Imaging: not only cross-sectional area

**Reviewer's code:** 00225366

### **COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

From the title, this article looks like a Review rather than an Editorial. I suggest the author considering extending this work to a Review article because it contains a lot of references. Editorial article should have a timely and hot topic to discuss focusing on the Editor's point of view.

**Regarding the number of references, please note that in the invitation that was sent for this Editorial "there are no restrictions on the number of words, figures (color, B/W) or authors for this invited submission.....". As a general rule, I agree that the number of references could be considered high, but for this paper in WJR it could be considered acceptable. WJR sent me an example of an Editorial with more that 50 References. This is an invited Editorial and the format could not be changed.**



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

### ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Radiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25627

**Title:** Peripheral Nerve Imaging: not only cross-sectional area

**Reviewer's code:** 00227565

#### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Good letter emphasizing on the far capabilities of subjective assessment of peripheral nerve imaging by US and MR. kindly, you can smoothly move to the latest paragraph without the title of conclusion. Moreover, the references have to be reduced to the least. Good Luck

**Regarding the number of references, please note that in the invitation that was sent for this Editorial "there are no restrictions on the number of words, figures (color, B/W) or authors for this invited submission.....". As a general rule, I agree that the number of references could be considered high, but for this paper in WJR it could be considered acceptable. WJR sent me an example of an editorial with more that 50 References. I corrected the last sentences. Thank you for the positive comments.**