

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 53494

Title: INCIDENTAL ANAL 18 FDG UPTAKE: SHOULD WE FURTHER EXAMINE THE PATIENT?

Reviewer's code: 03727239

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Chief Doctor, Director, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: France

Manuscript submission date: 2020-01-03

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-01-03 23:48

Reviewer performed review: 2020-01-10 11:01

Review time: 6 Days and 11 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

This study demonstrated the anal uptake of FDG and therapeutic intervention retrospectively. Although this is an important analysis on how to address the incidental anal uptake of FDG, I think there are some points that need to be explained more clearly.

Comment 1 The comparison of the patients who were offered treatment and those who were not is the main point of this article. Therefore, it is important to describe more clearly the rationale for and the definition of offering treatment. Was the decision to offer treatment decided only on the diagnosis and its severity? Are there any considerations about the patient's preference or prognosis that need to be taken into account?

Comment 2 The final diagnoses of the examined patients should be listed and compared between the patients who were offered treatment and those who were not. I think it is more important to detect neoplastic lesions than benign hemorrhoids.

Comment 3 The patients who were offered treatment appear to have been symptomatic more frequently than the patients who were not offered treatment. I think it is important to detect patients who should be offered treatment among asymptomatic patients. Among the 29 asymptomatic patients, were there any differences in FDG up-take between the patients who were offered treatment and those who were not? Please consider multivariate analysis, including FDG uptake and symptoms as factors affecting the offering of treatment.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 53494

Title: INCIDENTAL ANAL 18 FDG UPTAKE: SHOULD WE FURTHER EXAMINE THE PATIENT?

Reviewer's code: 02484487

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Academic Research, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Saudi Arabia

Author's Country/Territory: France

Manuscript submission date: 2020-01-03

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-01-04 15:19

Reviewer performed review: 2020-01-15 10:01

Review time: 10 Days and 18 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 checked="" 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
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

None

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 53494

Title: INCIDENTAL ANAL 18 FDG UPTAKE: SHOULD WE FURTHER EXAMINE THE PATIENT?

Reviewer's code: 03727239

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Chief Doctor, Director, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: France

Manuscript submission date: 2020-01-03

Reviewer chosen by: Jin-Zhou Tang (Quit in 2020)

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-04-15 04:02

Reviewer performed review: 2020-04-15 23:56

Review time: 19 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 checked="" 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 statements	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



**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>

The manuscript has been revised well. I think this manuscript will be acceptable.