



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 34107

**Title:** Preoperative [18]fluorodeoxyglucose-positron emission tomography/computed tomography in early stage breast cancer: Rates of distant metastases

**Reviewer's code:** 02104609

**Reviewer's country:** Canada

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-03-29

**Date reviewed:** 2017-03-29

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 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 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

A nice review article.



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 34107

**Title:** Preoperative [18]fluorodeoxyglucose-positron emission tomography/computed tomography in early stage breast cancer: Rates of distant metastases

**Reviewer’s code:** 00724450

**Reviewer’s country:** Turkey

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-03-29

**Date reviewed:** 2017-04-05

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" 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**

Dear Editor, Hung et al. presented a review title as “Preoperative 18FDG-PET/CT in early stage breast cancer” The topic is clinically important and developing because of predicting value of PET scan. The authors discussed only percentages of the PET scan positivity in stage I and IIA/B and some additional information such as grade, TNCB and age. We also well know that breast cancer is a heterogen status, include many prognostic and predictive parameters, authors did not state these data. When I red the topic, I wanted to learn what is the negative and positive predictive values of PET scan especially lymph nodes status, how they changes following the neoadjuvant treatment and comparison with other standart radiologic examination especially MRI. Additionally they did not define SUV parameters as well as Ki-67 status, HER 2 status and hormonal status (not only Triple negative patients data). My major concerns are, 1- How PET CT parameters (SUV max and others) changes with neoadjuvant treatment in early stage because this is the main topic can explain how PET CT are prognostic 2- If



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501, 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>

---

we compare the MRI and PET CT what are the difference in early BC 3- What are the difference between ER/PR positive and HER 2 positive patients with TNBC according to PET scan parameters in early BC.



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 34107

**Title:** Preoperative [18]fluorodeoxyglucose-positron emission tomography/computed tomography in early stage breast cancer: Rates of distant metastases

**Reviewer's code:** 03656600

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-03-29

**Date reviewed:** 2017-04-11

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] 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 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

This is a clear, well written and documented systematic review, and I suggest to accept and publish the article after minor revisions. I have no specific comments.