ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology
ESPS Manuscript NO: 7292
Title: DOES FDG UPTAKE ON COREGISTERED PET-CT PROVIDE ADDITIONAL PROGNOSTIC INFORMATION FOR UNSELECTED PATIENTS WITH CANCER OF THE ESOPHAGUS OR GASTROESOPHAGEAL JUNCTION
Reviewer code: 02445033
Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin
Date sent for review: 2013-11-13 16:17
Date reviewed: 2013-11-26 17:42

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[ ] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B (Very good)	[Y] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of	[ ] No records	
[ ] Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade E (Poor)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	[ ] Existed	[Y] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[ ] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
REVIEW MANUSCRIPT No. 7292 This report deals with the usefulness of SUV max as a marker of esophageal cancer prognosis. Although it is a retrospective study, it is well written and the authors have experience in this technology. I only would like to make two comments: - The authors make a survival analysis comparing quartiles of SUVmax. They also perform a logistic regression analysis to assess the influence of SUVmax on survival as an independent factor. However none of these methods are described in the "Methods" section. Which variables are included in the logistic regression model, and why?. - Since esophageal adenocarcinoma has a different metabolic activity that squamous carcinoma, the possibility that SUVmax could have some influence in prognosis of both cancers separately should be assessed. Finally, in the introduction third paragraph the reference is wrong. It should be [2]

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology
ESPS Manuscript NO: 7292
Title: DOES FDG UPTAKE ON COREGISTERED PET-CT PROVIDE ADDITIONAL PROGNOSTIC INFORMATION FOR UNSELECTED PATIENTS WITH CANCER OF THE ESOPHAGUS OR GASTROESOPHAGEAL JUNCTION
Reviewer code: 00058104
Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin
Date sent for review: 2013-11-13 16:17
Date reviewed: 2013-11-26 23:42

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[Y] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[Y] Grade B (Very good)	[ ] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for
[ ] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of	[ ] No records	publication
[ ] Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	[ ]Rejection
[ ] Grade E (Poor)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	[ ] Existed	[Y] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[ ] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

First of all, I would like to congratulate the authors for their effort. Authors present a retrospective study in order to address a clinical question about the independent effect of the prognostic information that maximum PET-CT FDG uptake could provide regarding patients with cancer of esophagus and gastroesophageal junction.   Major Comments: Patients and Methods / Results 1. It would be of great value and importance, since this is about the main aim of this study, that authors provide the variables used in the multivariate analysis, the model used, and comment on the simultaneous use or not of variables as T stage, N stage, UICC stage, Treatment intention, and Treatment type. Adding a table showing these data would be very informative, in order to support the conclusion.   Minor Comments: Introduction 1. Explain the abbreviation "UICC" on its first use in the text.   Patients and Methods 2. The PET-CT scanner used during the years 2006-2008 was different than the one used since 2008. Have authors assessed the impact of the "time" and "scanner" change, i.e. are there any differences between these two periods, or are there any differences from year to year, by means of, at least, the variables presented in this study? It would be valuable if these data could be added. In any case, authors should comment on this issue in the discussion section of the manuscript. 3. It might be more suitable to describe the Institutional Review Board approval and waiver of consent at the initial part of the "patients and methods" section. Identically, one should begin the "patients and methods" section with this.   Results: 4. In the results section, the patients' numbers in the phrase: "… Stage 4 disease was defined on the basis of distant metastatic disease in 31

patients and on the basis of celiac axis lymphadenopathy in 46 patients…" do not fit the patients' numbers in the phrase "… and Stage 4 (80 patients)…". Please, reconcile.   Discussion 5. One of the terms "esophagus" or "oesophagus" should be used, for text consistency purposes.   6. Regarding the phrase ..." The median value of 10.9 identified in the current study…": There are no data in the results section text or in a corresponding table that present this.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7292

Title: DOES FDG UPTAKE ON COREGISTERED PET-CT PROVIDE ADDITIONAL PROGNOSTIC INFORMATION FOR UNSELECTED PATIENTS WITH CANCER OF THE ESOPHAGUS OR GASTROESOPHAGEAL JUNCTION

Reviewer code: 00538725

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-11-13 16:17

Date reviewed: 2013-12-04 20:59

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[ ] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B (Very good)	[Y] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	[ ]Rejection
[ ] Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E (Poor)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	[ ] Existed	[Y] Major revision
		[ ] No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1) UICC 7th ed. TNM staging system has commonly been used in the practice. It's better to restage the diseases according to the 7th ed. 2) The statistical methods were not fully descripted. Besides, why not Cox regression for survival analysis but logistic regression?

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology
ESPS Manuscript NO: 7292
Title: DOES FDG UPTAKE ON COREGISTERED PET-CT PROVIDE ADDITIONAL PROGNOSTIC INFORMATION FOR UNSELECTED PATIENTS WITH CANCER OF THE ESOPHAGUS OR GASTROESOPHAGEAL JUNCTION
Reviewer code: 02446287
Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin
Date sent for review: 2013-11-13 16:17
Date reviewed: 2013-12-16 04:36

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[Y] Grade A (Excellent)	[Y] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[ ] Grade B (Very good)	[ ] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for
[ ] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of	[ ] No records	publication
[ ] Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	[ ]Rejection
[ ] Grade E (Poor)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	[ ] Existed	[ ] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[ ] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Dear Authors,   Congratulations on the important study of esophageal carcinoma.