PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 39297

Title: Role of pre-transplant 18F-FDG PET/CT in predicting hepatocellular carcinoma recurrence after liver transplantation

Reviewer's code: 03571551

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-04-11

Date reviewed: 2018-04-11

Review time: 11 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	[Y] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Accept (General priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Minor revision	[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Major revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[ ] Advanced
			[ ] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[ ] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This review article focuses on the use of 18F-FDG PET/CT in the pre-transplant evaluation of HCC patients with special discussion on its ability to predict HCC recurrence after LT. An interesting manuscript present a good summation in the field of

LT. There are no obvious concerns in this manuscript.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 39297

Title: Role of pre-transplant 18F-FDG PET/CT in predicting hepatocellular carcinoma recurrence after liver transplantation

Reviewer's code: 02992614

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-04-11

Date reviewed: 2018-04-12

Review time: 21 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Accept (General priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[Y] Minor revision	[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Major revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[ ] Advanced
			[ ] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[ ] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a well written review. There are few questions for the authors to respond. 1. Any study comparing the new Primovist MRI and PET scan? 2. Please add the role of dual-tracers (18F FDG and C11 acetate) PET scan in the review. Although not many countries

have C11 acetate, it is certainly very important and can guide our management. 3. Any histology pathological correlation with the 18F FDG PET scan in liver resection?

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 39297

Title: Role of pre-transplant 18F-FDG PET/CT in predicting hepatocellular carcinoma recurrence after liver transplantation

Reviewer's code: 01755994

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-04-11

Date reviewed: 2018-04-12

Review time: 1 Day

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[Y] Accept (General priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Minor revision	[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Major revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[ ] Advanced
			[ ] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[ ] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This review article focused on the use of 18F-FDG PET/CT in the pre-transplant evaluation of HCC patients with special discussion on its ability to predict HCC recurrence after LT. It is well written and with a good overview. Under 'Correlation

between 18F-FDG PET/CT and morphological criteria' and 'Role of 18F-FDG PET/CT in predicting posttransplant HCC recurrence', the definitions of PET/CT positive vs PET/CT negative for each described reports should be elaborated. For instance, does a negative scan mean completely no detection of intrahepatic/extrahepatic HCCs? Or does it mean low SUV uptake and if so, the definition of low vs high SUV uptake. These information should be tabulated for easy comparison. It is widely known that 18F-FDGPET/CT has relatively poor sensitivity and specificity for HCC, discussion on the use of C11-choline or 18F-fluorocholine PET/CT in the staging of HCC should be made. Specifically, their role in assessing pre-transplant patients should be discussed.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 39297

Title: Role of pre-transplant 18F-FDG PET/CT in predicting hepatocellular carcinoma recurrence after liver transplantation

Reviewer's code: 00051373

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-04-11

Date reviewed: 2018-04-14

Review time: 3 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[Y] Accept (General priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[Y] Grade C: Good			[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Minor revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Major revision	[ ] Advanced
		[ ] Rejection	[ ] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[ ] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

A mini review of role of pre-transplant 18F-FDG PET/CT in predicting hepatocellular carcinoma recurrence after liver transplantation. Well written and more update information in the liver transplantation. It should be accepting for publication.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 39297

Title: Role of pre-transplant 18F-FDG PET/CT in predicting hepatocellular carcinoma recurrence after liver transplantation

Reviewer's code: 03529718

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-04-11

Date reviewed: 2018-04-14

Review time: 3 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Accept (General priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[Y] Minor revision	[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Major revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[ ] Advanced
			[ ] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[ ] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Manuscript is interesting and adequate but the structure is not complete. In my opinion, introduction is so long, most of them it would be discussion. Variables of study should be better defined.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 39297

Title: Role of pre-transplant 18F-FDG PET/CT in predicting hepatocellular carcinoma recurrence after liver transplantation

Reviewer's code: 03475029

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-04-11

Date reviewed: 2018-04-15

Review time: 4 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	[Y] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Accept (General priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Minor revision	[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Major revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[ ] Advanced
			[ ] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[ ] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a well written Review. Yaprak et al. reviewed the use of 18F-FDG PET/CT in the pre-transplant predicting of hepatocellular carcinoma recurrence after liver transplantation. There are several minor concerns about the manuscript.   1. In the

second paragraph of the Introduction, the author stated: "Until the landmark study by Mazzaferroet al. [5] in 1996, the liberal selection of patients for LT resulted in high recurrence rates and poor survival." Does the author mean the selection of HCC patients for LT? 2. There are some grammatical errors. For example, "Despite initial hesitancy against the use of pre-transplant tumor biopsy, Toronto criteria has led the way to the use of histological criteria in selection of patients with HCC for LT [12]." (Page 4, Lines 3-5) should be read "..., Toronto criteria have led the way to ..." Minor language polishing is needed.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No