

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Meta-Analysis

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 11291

**Title:** Accuracy of F-18 FDG PET to Monitor Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy Response in Bone and Soft Tissue Sarcoma: An Updated Meta-analysis

**Reviewer code:** 00289416

**Science editor:** Ling-Ling Wen

**Date sent for review:** 2014-05-14 23:00

**Date reviewed:** 2014-05-27 23:41

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Interesting meta-analysis on the use of PET CT in the evaluation of patients with sarcomas of both soft tissue and bone after chemoradiation with a curative intent. The authors have used all the appropriate scientific methodologies used for the preparation of meta-analyses and their results are extremely interesting and supported by the literature. The authors conclude that PET scan is a promising diagnostic tool in the evaluation of neo-adjuvant treatment response in sarcomas.

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Meta-Analysis

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 11291

**Title:** Accuracy of F-18 FDG PET to Monitor Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy Response in Bone and Soft Tissue Sarcoma: An Updated Meta-analysis

**Reviewer code:** 02683233

**Science editor:** Ling-Ling Wen

**Date sent for review:** 2014-05-14 23:00

**Date reviewed:** 2014-05-29 04:31

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Accuracy of F-18 FDG PET to monitor neoadjuvant chemotherapy response in bone and soft tissue sarcoma: an updated meta analysis. I enjoyed reading this well written and conducted meta analysis. Major Points 1. The authors should discuss in detail the lack of an agreed standard for assessing PET response to chemotherapy. For example what is the basis for using a reduction in SUV of 2.5 as an indicator of response? Has this been validated in prospective studies? These are important points that need to be discussed. Is a reduction in SUV from 10 to 7.5 the same as a reduction in SUV from 7.5 to 5? 2. The authors also need to discuss the limitations in terms of "pathological" response to therapy, particularly in soft tissue sarcoma. Percentage necrosis is a good prognostic indicator in patients with osteosarcoma, but "pathological" response has not been validated in soft tissue sarcoma. There are only retrospective studies suggesting prognostic role for pathological response in soft tissue sarcoma and many patients in these series also had pre-operative radiation. This is an important point that really needs to be emphasized and discussed. Please address this in regard to the statements made on page 4 of the manuscript. Were different pathological response criteria used for the different studies? 3. Also on Page 4 the comments regarding cure rates needs to be more specific, particularly as the authors alternate between grouping patients together but also discuss individual subtypes such as osteosarcoma and Ewing sarcoma. 4. In addition, patients with osteosarcoma and Ewing sarcoma are usually treated with different chemotherapy



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

schedules – this again needs to be emphasized, particularly in relation to the result of this meta analysis.

5. It is also important to clarify the exact process for resolving discrepancies. Was an external reviewer requested to arbitrate? Minor Points 1. Page 6: When was PET first introduced in the clinical arena, was it 1980? 2. Please describe the QUADAS tool in a little more detail?