Reviewer’s report

Title: Specificity of Transcranial Sonography in Parkinson Spectrum Disorders in Comparison to Degenerative Cognitive Syndromes

Version: 2 Date: 6 December 2011

Reviewer: Marek Belohlavek

Reviewer’s report:

I have only a few remaining suggestions for improvement:
1) Please consult further your colleague, who helped you with grammar when you were revising the manuscript. There are numerous, rather long sentences that need to be subdivided into short, clear statements. Also, sentences starting with "It" and/or those that are written in a passive tense should be avoided whenever possible. For example, "...It was given an important note by Professor Berg..." would read much better as "Professor Berg noted..." or "...It is almost the same problem with which SPECT struggles, when is performed..." would read much better as "...SPECT has the same limitations when performed...", etc, etc.
2) In Discussion, please rephrase the statement "It is a matter of concern about false positives in screening tests, as we don’t want to tell someone that they have a serious disease when they do not really have it." Readers should know what false positivity means. For example, say: "Our intent was to reduce false positive results so as to minimize or avoid stress to patients."
3) In Conclusions, please rephrase the generic statement "...due to the specificity values not being comprehensive" to a statement that will clearly convey to a reader what is the problem or limitation in the specificity of the results. After all, some people read only the Conclusion.