

3 July 2013

Dear Editor,

Title: **Significance of Unexpected FDG-PET Uptake in the Gastrointestinal Tract: Endoscopic and Histopathological correlations**

Authors: **Goldin Eran, Mahmud Mahamid, Koslowsky Benjamin, Dubner Yael, Lalazar Gadi, Wengrower Dov**

Name of journal: **World Journal of Gastroenterology**

ESPS manuscript NO: **3100**

We would like to thank the editorial board and the three reviewers for the thoughtful review of our manuscript. We have revised the paper in response to the reviewers' comments. A revised manuscript, with changes tracked, is enclosed.

With this letter, we wish to respond to each of the points raised by the reviewers.

We here declare that this final proof of the manuscript was performed by native English speaker. This was done by one of the co-authors of this paper. All grammar, typos, references and tables were revised accordingly.

Reviewer no. 00503045:

1. **"References in the text should be listed properly, in a similar way".**

Reply: thank you for that remark. We have revised the references and corrected them to comply to the journals style.

2. **"In discussion please delete the data from results, and concentrate on the importance of PET-PDG in finding new pathologies during the follow-up".**

Reply: this remark was very important and taken very seriously in our revision and the corrections are provided in the revised manuscript. The first two sentences in the second paragraph of the discussion was erased and an additional sentence was added and the end of the fifth paragraph in the discussion.

Reviewer no. 00713469:

1. **"In the "material and methods" section: proper patients collection. However, as the role of the PET reader appears to be crucial the years of expertise should be reported as well as those of the radiologists. It would be better to perform a blinded and a two readers lecture. Nevertheless, if the reader holds at least 15-years of expertise the last issue can be ruled out"**

Reply: this remark is obviously very important, and was considered when we submitted the article. All the radiologists were experienced doctors, with a minimum of 5 years experience. In order to fill in the gap of the expertise years, all the PET-CT exams, were reviewed in a weekly radiologic meeting, where very experienced doctors attended. This paragraph was added to the article, at the third to the last sentence in the first paragraph of the section "methods".

2. **"The discussion has been adequately focused on the findings. It appears essential like the whole manuscript but it could be an added value"**

Reply: thank you for that remark as it was very well taken. The first two sentences in the second paragraph of the discussion was erased and an additional sentence was added and the end of the fifth paragraph in the discussion.

3. **"References: be aware ! in the text some appear in superscript"**

Reply: as previously mentioned, we have provided a new version and revised the reference section accordingly.

4. **"Concerning the statistical analysis: a chapter is mandatory, it must be reported. (i.e. the means, the t-test, the correlation, the significance and methods adopted have to be cited). We consider that this issue can be solved by the authors with a minimal effort."**

Reply: this comment is very important. We have added a chapter named "statistical analysis" to report the statistical methods used in this article. This chapter was added at the end of the 'methods' section.

5. **"We strongly suggest to quote (for this analysis) within the introduction and/or the discussion the following paper (Colorectal cancer and 18FDG-PET/CT: what about adding the T to the N parameter in loco-regional staging? World J Gastroenterol. 2011 Mar 21;17(11):1427-33. by Mainenti et al.) 4. Additionally, (optional, not mandatory) in the first sentence of the discussion**

(i.e. reference 1,3) the following can be quoted (Q J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2009 Apr;53(2):167-80. by Salvatore et al.)”

Reply: thank you for the thorough reference additions. We have gone through both of these articles, and have found them to have an additional importance to our article aims and findings. Both suggestions were added to the current manuscript.

Reviewer no. 00860822

1. **“This is a retrospective study the patients from two hospitals, so it was still not a strictly multicenter study. This should be appeared in the paper presented as two institutes, but not multicenters.”**

Reply: this remark was clearly understood, and was corrected in the first sentence in the paragraph of "methods".

2. **“No demographic data of the patients were presented and some baseline and biochemical lab values were also lacked.”**

Reply: this remark is clearly understood, and appears to be important. Unfortunately, we do not have the demographic and laboratory data other than the data presented in the article. Due to the retrospective design, this data was very hard to collect accurately. Although this a drawback in this study, it did not seem crucial to have an effect on the importance and innovative results shown in this article.

3. **“Even the manuscript presented the data like in the figures 2 and 3, but not statistics there.”**

Reply: thank you, we have added statistical significance into figures 2 and 3

4. **“Even this was a retrospective study, no ethical approval was given.”**

Reply: this remark was clearly considered when we embarked to perform this study. We have received an exemption for applying to the local Helsinki committee. This was due to the retrospective format of this manuscript.

Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in the *World Journal of Gastroenterology*.

Sincerely yours,

Benjamin Koslowsky M.D.
Digestive Diseases Institute
Shaare Zedek Medical Center
12 Bayit street.
Affiliated with the Hebrew University Medical School
Jerusalem, Israel. 91031
Tel: 972-2-6666064
Fax: 972-2-6666050
e-mail : binyaminkos@szmc.org.il