PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 72848

Title: Is there utility for 18F-FDG PET scan before surgery in breast cancer? A 15-year overall survival analysis

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05085948

Position: Associate Editor

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: Belgium

Manuscript submission date: 2021-11-15

Reviewer chosen by: Ze-Mao Gong

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-07 09:02

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-07 10:41

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article is interesting. At the present, PET scan is only indicated in breast cancer advanced cases in which further suspicion symptoms of tumoral spread are present; this is due to the relative non-specificity of the imaging technique with a considerable number of false-negative items, since the Authors report 26 positive lymphnode metastases in 63 negative PETs. Furthermore, they use PET scan in stage IIIB tumors in which nodal involvement is strongly suspected, regardless a PET scan execution. However, the long time study and the strong significativity of the SUV ratio between involved and non involved breast/axilla make the hypotesis of introducing PET scan in pre-treatment evaluation of advanced breast cancer patients interesting, in the way to plane a more aggressive therapy.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 72848

Title: Is there utility for 18F-FDG PET scan before surgery in breast cancer? A 15-year overall survival analysis

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05689407

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Postdoc

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: Belgium

Manuscript submission date: 2021-11-15

Reviewer chosen by: Ze-Mao Gong

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-07 02:36

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-08 19:29

Review time: 1 Day and 16 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No

| **Peer-reviewer statements** | Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous   [   ] Onymous |
| | Conflicts-of-Interest: [   ] Yes   [Y] No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The use of abbreviations in titles is not recommended. Informed consent is not in english.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 72848

Title: Is there utility for 18F-FDG PET scan before surgery in breast cancer? A 15-year overall survival analysis

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05838574

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: Belgium

Manuscript submission date: 2021-11-15

Reviewer chosen by: Ze-Mao Gong

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-11 18:13

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-11 19:46

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The subject of your study is very interesting. I would like you to describe the scene, places, and corresponding dates, including possible exposure, monitoring and data collection? The clinics/hospital location, area is not mentioned clearly. Table titles are incomplete. It would be interesting to put the location and date of the analyzed data. What are the limitations of your study?

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good
	[ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing
	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority)
	[ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. "surgery was done without delay in 85 (81.7%) and was preceded by neoadjuvant therapy in 19 (18.3%). What surgery were taken? Without delay was mean how long? 2. "SUVs were measured on regions of interest, regardless of visual enhancement; hence, these were available in all breast, axillary, and sternal sites." Why done as this way? 3. " Survival differences were not evident when comparing positive PET breast or distant status separately"." Survival differences were also not evident on subgroup analyses on PET axillary status for tumors ≤ 20 mm." Maybe authors had any conjecture? 4. " Measures of variation and separation show the importance of PET for OS, which represent a strong prognostic factor at 15 years." Does this sentence was got from table 3? 5. table 3, "The hazard ratios for age", the age was about how old? Full model means what? 6." the sensitivity and the specificity of the PET were 61% (range: 54%–67%) and 80% (79%–81%) respectively", in this article, maybe authors have had considered the sensitivity and the specificity of the PET? 7." A diagnostic check of proportional hazards found departure of proportionality with DFS." The sentence means what?

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 72848

Title: Is there utility for 18F-FDG PET scan before surgery in breast cancer? A 15-year overall survival analysis

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05771662

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Belgium

Manuscript submission date: 2021-11-15

Reviewer chosen by: Ze-Mao Gong

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-13 18:17

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-22 02:12

Review time: 8 Days and 7 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No

| **Peer-reviewer statements** | Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous   [   ] Onymous |
| | Conflicts-of-Interest: [   ] Yes   [Y] No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. This study is a retrospective study, so there is a data bias. 2. SUV value and region selection, how to ensure consistency？ 3. Why choose 2cm for tumor size and what is the basis？ 4.Should the effect of different molecular typing on the results be considered?