

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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 78269

Title: Significance of incidental focal fluorine-18 fluorodeoxyglucose uptake in

colon/rectum, thyroid, and prostate: with a brief literature review

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05821532 Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Senior Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2022-06-17

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-17 08:31

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-25 23:48

Review time: 8 Days and 15 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Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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 [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] 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	[Y]Yes []No



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer statements

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

see the attachment



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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 78269

Title: Significance of incidental focal fluorine-18 fluorodeoxyglucose uptake in

colon/rectum, thyroid, and prostate: with a brief literature review

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05213310 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Full Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Saudi Arabia

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2022-06-17

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: $2022-07-10\ 01:34$

Reviewer performed review: 2022-07-10 01:54

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) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



Baishideng **Publishing**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Please work on making the following changes: 1. The research title should be changed to match the study's objective, so that it is within twenty words or less, which is one of the specifications and a good title. 2. Avoiding lengthening the study abstract by condensing it. 3. In the results section of the study abstract, you should only show the most important research findings. 4. Rewriting a section of the paper's introduction based on more recent references, with the final paragraph devoted to demonstrating the study's purpose. 5. Continue to work on adding references that are consistent with the examination technique described in section two of material and methods. 6. In the results section, go over the data flow. 7. Avoiding jargon titles in the discussion section, while highlighting the study's strengths and weaknesses in the final paragraph. 8. Write the conclusion in a more creative manner. 9. When necessary, update the references with a recent review. 10. Check the paper for typos and spelling errors. Kind regards,



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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 78269

Title: Significance of incidental focal fluorine-18 fluorodeoxyglucose uptake in

colon/rectum, thyroid, and prostate: with a brief literature review

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00071178 Position: Editor-in-Chief

Academic degree: FACS, FICS, MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2022-06-17

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-07-10 05:03

Reviewer performed review: 2022-07-22 22:25

Review time: 12 Days and 17 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) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



Baishideng **Publishing**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

https://www.wjgnet.com

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer statements

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I did not understand precisely what the purpose of this study was. Why did you aim to investigate the FDG uptake of four organs in the human body? The summary section is too long. It's a lengthy read. I did not understand how this approach would contribute to the literature. I could understand if the FDG uptake of different cancers of the same organ was investigated. Or, if the different behavior patterns of the same cancer of the same organ (metastatic vs. non-metastatic) were investigated, I would understand. In Table 2, the p values obtained from the ROC analysis should be written. In terms of the area under the curve, it will be seen that all values are significant at the border. Since you have given men and women as two different groups in Table 1, the statistical analysis should be made between these two groups, and the p-value should be given. In Table 1, malignant and premalignant diseases are given separately. However, in figure 2, it is seen that malign and premalignant lesions are provided as a group. Which one is right? This error must be corrected.