

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 53145

Title: Evaluation of ¹⁷⁷Lu-Dotatate treatment in patients with metastatic neuroendocrine tumors and new possible prognostic factors.

Reviewer's code: 03388124

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Attending Doctor

Reviewer's country: United States

Author's country: Spain

Manuscript submission date: 2019-12-08

Reviewer chosen by: Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-12-14 12:49

Reviewer performed review: 2019-12-21 15:51

Review time: 7 Days and 3 Hours

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors reviewed their experience with PRRT treatment of metastatic neuroendocrine neoplasms and explored parameters that are associated with treatment response and patient survival. 1. Close to 30% of the author's cohort are pancreatic tumors, which rarely produce carcinoid syndrome. How can the author justify using "carcinoid syndrome" as a parameter to evaluate the patient's quality of life for all cases? 2. The current WHO classification of neuroendocrine neoplasm separates well-differentiated NET G3 from poor differentiated neuroendocrine carcinoma (PDNEC). Although the latter is typically treated with systemic chemotherapy, the optimal treatment for the former is unclear. Thus it would be of great interest to carefully analyze that group of patients. In this manuscript, the author states that tumors with Ki67 <20% accounted for 36.1% (which implies that tumors with Ki67 >20% in 63.9%), while in table 1 Grade 3 tumor is listed as 8.3%, this is clearly a discrepancy and needs to be reconciled. In addition, a critical question is that how many of those high grade tumors are NET G3 and how many are PDNEC? PDNET does not show robust expression of SSTR, and understandably, probably does not respond well to PRRT. 3. For statistical analysis, please list the p value even it is small, such as $p < 0.0001$ or $p = 0.001$, instead of $p = 0.00$ (which cannot be 0).

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 53145

Title: Evaluation of ¹⁷⁷Lu-Dotatate treatment in patients with metastatic neuroendocrine tumors and new possible prognostic factors.

Reviewer's code: 01800952

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FACP, FRCP (Hon), MD

Professional title: Emeritus Professor

Reviewer's country: India

Author's country: Spain

Manuscript submission date: 2019-12-08

Reviewer chosen by: Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-01-10 05:34

Reviewer performed review: 2020-01-13 07:05

Review time: 3 Days and 1 Hour

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have followed 36 patients with advanced neuroendocrine tumours with rescue therapy which involved use of ¹⁷⁷Lu peptide receptor radionuclide therapy (PRRT). Four sessions of PRRT were administered as per protocol and patients were followed for interim change in metabolic and radiological imaging; Quality of life as defined and overall survival. Of course, patients were watched for toxicity of PRRT. As expected and due to underlying advanced disease, there was some improvement in the disease state and prolongation of survival. Prognostic criteria for response and survival were defined. The study is well done and patient follow up has been good and the information given on therapy, response and toxicity is well described. I have following comments to make: 1. Patient information prior to treatment has been exhaustive and could be made concise by making table 1 more informative. The patient information could be referred to table given. 2. Similarly, the response could be made more informative and accurate by giving a table related to response. Through this readers shall get a quick look at the type of response by PRRT. 3. Though authors have included definition of new prognostic criteria for response to PRRT, I don't think they have invented any new prognostic criteria. The title should be re-framed without mentioning "new prognostic criteria".

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 53145

Title: Evaluation of ¹⁷⁷Lu-Dotatate treatment in patients with metastatic neuroendocrine tumors and new possible prognostic factors.

Reviewer's code: 02577402

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's country: China

Author's country: Spain

Manuscript submission date: 2019-12-08

Reviewer chosen by: Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-01-09 00:48

Reviewer performed review: 2020-01-18 02:47

Review time: 9 Days and 1 Hour

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



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this study, the authors reported the treatment effect in patients with metastatic neuroendocrine tumors and new possible prognostic factors. Some problems existed. 1. The language needs to be improved because of some grammar mistakes. 2. Key words: Use simple words for key words. Do not repeat some words. For example, in the phrases of: gastropancreatic neuroendocrine tumroes and neuroendocrine tumors, neuroendocrine was used twice. 3. In the MM section, what are the exclusion criteria? 4. What does SSA mean? 5. Use of abbreviations: When using abbreviations, the full phrase should be given at the first time of use. Later, you can always use the abbreviation without mentioning the full phrase. There are a lot of abbreviations. Please reduce the number of abbreviations and give the full phrase at the first time of use.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No