

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5881

Title: Multimodal Imaging Evaluation in Staging of Rectal Cancer

Reviewer code: 00058180

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-09-29 15:13

Date reviewed: 2013-10-04 11:35

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Existed	<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"/> [] Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This review article is well organized and acceptable for publication. Minor points for revision: 1.A table summarizing the advantages and disadvantages of different staging modalities would be preferable. 2.The paragraph about the PET/CT in preoperative settings is too short. The role of PET/CT changing the M staging and treatment strategy should be discussed.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5881

Title: Multimodal Imaging Evaluation in Staging of Rectal Cancer

Reviewer code: 00058378

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-09-29 15:13

Date reviewed: 2013-10-14 22:49

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The current manuscript summarizes the current literature about rectal cancer imaging. The review is well written, however, I have some limitations that need to be addressed. 1. The review is too extensive; moreover, I suggest changing the structure of the manuscript in order to make it more attractive to the readers. It could be more related to the clinical importance and application of certain imaging techniques. When do we need, which technique? Does the height of the tumour play role, etc. 2. I suggest focusing on new or future developments as well.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5881

Title: Multimodal Imaging Evaluation in Staging of Rectal Cancer

Reviewer code: 00039316

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-09-29 15:13

Date reviewed: 2013-10-25 11:01

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a well structured review that contains a lot of info. In order to become more comprehensive for the average reader, I propose: 1. Addition of 2 tables to summarize the advantages and disadvantages of the described modalities i. Pre-treatment and ii. Post-treatment 2. Addition of one paragraph that will present the future directions for the Multimodal Imaging Evaluation in Staging of Rectal Cancer

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5881

Title: Multimodal Imaging Evaluation in Staging of Rectal Cancer

Reviewer code: 00004187

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-09-29 15:13

Date reviewed: 2013-11-11 06:24

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Abstract. Abbreviations of CRM Introduction Add this reference in the second paragraph of the introduction. Enríquez-Navascués JM, Borda N, Lizerazu A, Placer C, Elosegui JL, Ciria JP, Lacasta A, Bujanda L. Patterns of local recurrence in rectal cancer after a multidisciplinary approach. World J Gastroenterol. 2011 Apr 7;17(13):1674-84. doi: 10.3748/wjg.v17.i13.1674. Review. PubMed PMID: 21483626; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3072630. Section CT. Specify lymph node sizes. "Due to a lack of consensus ragrding the cut-off diameter required to determine Whether a lymph node is metastatic" What is advanced rectal cancer? T3-T4? Delete paragraph referred to CT colonography. Section MRI The conclusion is incorrect. "Thus, MRI is the best method ..." If the kappa value is 0.36 for identification of peritoneal attachments .. Add two algorithm for rectal cancer staging and for evaluation after neoadjuvant chemoradiation therapy ..