

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 74499

**Title:** Assessment of incidental focal colorectal uptake by analysis of fluorine-18 fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography parameters

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 01588784

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor, Senior Lecturer, Surgeon

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Japan

**Author's Country/Territory:** South Korea

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-12-27

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-12-27 11:17

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-12-28 23:27

**Review time:** 1 Day and 12 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
-------------------------------------	---

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This study evaluated the clinical significance of incidental focal colorectal FDG uptake on F-18 FDG PET/CT in the diagnosis of colorectal malignant/premalignant lesions. The detection rate of incidental focal colorectal uptake was 0.53% and 61% of the eligible lesions were malignant or premalignant. The authors concluded that SUV max was an independent diagnostic parameter for malignant/premalignant lesions, and suspicious focal colorectal FDG uptake requires attention and further evaluation. This paper was well written with appropriate methodology and appealing images. This paper may be strengthened if the following points were considered for further review. Specific points:

1. Population bias: Since this study analyzed the individuals undergoing PET/CT under presence/suspicious of hypermetabolic pathologies, these group of patients may have increased incidence of malignancy compared to general population. In addition, this study excluded the individuals for whom histopathological reports were not available (or not confirmed). These issues can be added to the "limitations".
2. Redundant paragraph: The 5th paragraph (starting with "Among the 24 malignant lesions,...") discussed about sidedness of colorectal lesions. The discussion was based on the findings of only 24 malignant lesions found incidentally on PET/CT, therefore, the comparison to other large epidemiologic data may be less meaningful. The authors may be advised to shorten or omit this paragraph.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 74499

**Title:** Assessment of incidental focal colorectal uptake by analysis of fluorine-18 fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography parameters

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05774529

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** FASCRS, MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Deputy Director

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** South Korea

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-12-27

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-01-04 00:06

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-01-13 02:17

**Review time:** 9 Days and 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" 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>

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="radio"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="radio"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

1. How was the sample size determined? Was there power to detect differences? 2. Why reschedule the examination time for cases with blood glucose level  $\geq 11$  mmol / L? Is there any literature support? 3. The highlights of the results are not so prominent. The comparison between the images and tables in the results is confusing, so it is suggested to consider using the appendix for display. 4. Language needs polishing.

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 74499

**Title:** Assessment of incidental focal colorectal uptake by analysis of fluorine-18 fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography parameters

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 01588784

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor, Senior Lecturer, Surgeon

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Japan

**Author's Country/Territory:** South Korea

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-12-27

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ji-Hong Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-02-18 10:39

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-02-18 10:50

**Review time:** 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**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>

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The revised manuscript is well written, and the authors have adequately repounded to the reviewers' queries with sufficient references.