**Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited**
Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

**ESPS Peer-review Report**
**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology
**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 3100
**Title:** Significance of Unexpected FDG-PET Uptake in the Gastrointestinal Tract: Endoscopic and Histopathological correlations
**Reviewer code:** 00860822
**Science editor:** Song, Xiu-Xia
**Date sent for review:** 2013-04-08 14:42
**Date reviewed:** 2013-04-08 22:24

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | RECOMMENDATION | CONCLUSION |
|---|---|---|---|
| [ ] Grade A (Excellent) | [ Y] Grade A: Priority Publishing | Google Search: | [ ] Accept |
| [ Y] Grade B (Very good) | [ ] Grade B: minor language polishing | [ ] Existed | [ Y] High priority for publication |
| [ ] Grade C (Good) | [ ] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing | [ ] No records | |
| [ ] Grade D (Fair) | | BPG Search: | [ ]Rejection |
| [ ] Grade E (Poor) | [ ] Grade D: rejected | [ ] Existed | [ ] Minor revision |
| | | [ ] No records | [ ] Major revision |

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This study evaluated the nature and significance of unexpected FDG-PET uptake within the gastrointestinal tract (GIT), and found unexpected FDG uptake in the GIT is commonly encountered and the authors suggested that endoscopy and pathology evaluation is justified in order to detect these additional findings. I have some issues for this manuscript: 1. This is a retrospective study the patients from two hospitals, so it was still not a strictly multicenter study. This should be appeared in the paper presented as two institutes, but not multicenters. 2. No demographic data of the patients were presented and some baseline and biochemical lab values were also lacked. 3. Even the manuscript presented the data like in the figures 2 and 3, but not statistics there. 4. Even this was a retrospective study, no ethical approval was given.

**Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited**
Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

**ESPS Peer-review Report**
**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology
**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 3100
**Title:** Significance of Unexpected FDG-PET Uptake in the Gastrointestinal Tract: Endoscopic and Histopathological correlations
**Reviewer code:** 00713469
**Science editor:** Song, Xiu-Xia
**Date sent for review:** 2013-04-08 14:42
**Date reviewed:** 2013-04-09 15:49

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | RECOMMENDATION | CONCLUSION |
|---|---|---|---|
| [ ] Grade A (Excellent) | [ ] Grade A: Priority Publishing | Google Search: | [ Y] Accept |
| [ Y] Grade B (Very good) | [ Y] Grade B: minor language polishing | [ ] Existed | [ ] High priority for publication |
| [ ] Grade C (Good) | [ ] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing | [ ] No records | [ ]Rejection |
| [ ] Grade D (Fair) | [ ] Grade D: rejected | BPG Search: | [ ] Minor revision |
| [ ] Grade E (Poor) | | [ ] Existed | [ ] Major revision |
| | | [ ] No records | |

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**
General Comments The authors present a study about the significance of unexpected FDG-PET uptake in the gastrointestinal tract. In addition, the correlation with endoscopic and histopathological findings has been reported. The paper appears well written and structured correctly. The idea is not new since the finding that the 50% of the incidental FDG uptakes correlate with pathological results has already been reported. However, the relationship with several histopathological specimens has not been extensively addressed so far. It appears to be done rationally in the present paper. of pathological sufficiently new since the proposed approach should be routinely adopted. The authors' priority was to consider if unexpected FDG-PET uptake would be accurately weigh when performing PET studies. The design of the study is appropriate and the data sound. Thus, we'd like report on the following comments and issues that should be solved with focused but mandatory efforts: Positive comments and minor essential revisions 1. The introduction has been structured accordingly to the aim of the study. 2. In the "material and methods" section: proper patients collection. However, as the role of the PET reader appears to be crucial the years of expertise should be reported as well as those of the radiologists. It would be better to perform a blinded and a two readers lecture. Nevertheless, if the reader holds at least 15-years of expertise the last issue can be ruled out. 3. The discussion has been adequately focused on the findings. It appears essential like the whole manuscript but it could be an added value. 4. References: be aware ! in the text some appear in superscript…… Major mandatory revisions 1. The title is quite right. 2. Concerning the statistical analysis: a chapter is mandatory, it must be reported. (i.e. the means, the t-test, the correlation, the significance and methods adopted have to be cited). We consider that this issue can be solved by the

authors with a minimal effort. 3. We strongly suggest to quote (for this analysis) within the introduction and/or the discussion the following paper (Colorectal cancer and 18FDG-PET/CT: what about adding the T to the N parameter in loco-regional staging? World J Gastroenterol. 2011 Mar 21;17(11):1427-33. by Mainenti et al.) 4. Additionally, (optional, not mandatory) in the first sentence of the discussion (i.e. reference 1,3) the following can be quoted (Q J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2009 Apr;53(2):167-80. by Salvatore et al.)

**Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited**
Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

**ESPS Peer-review Report**
**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology
**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 3100
**Title:** Significance of Unexpected FDG-PET Uptake in the Gastrointestinal Tract: Endoscopic and Histopathological correlations
**Reviewer code:** 00503045
**Science editor:** Song, Xiu-Xia
**Date sent for review:** 2013-04-08 14:42
**Date reviewed:** 2013-04-10 17:16

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | RECOMMENDATION | CONCLUSION |
|---|---|---|---|
| [ ] Grade A (Excellent) | [ ] Grade A: Priority Publishing | Google Search: | [ ] Accept |
| [Y] Grade B (Very good) | [Y] Grade B: minor language polishing | [ ] Existed | [ ] High priority for publication |
| [ ] Grade C (Good) | [ ] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing | [ ] No records | [ ]Rejection |
| [ ] Grade D (Fair) | [ ] Grade D: rejected | BPG Search: | [Y] Minor revision |
| [ ] Grade E (Poor) | | [ ] Existed | [ ] Major revision |
| | | [ ] No records | |

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**
This study is of high practical importance. The high sensitivity and specificity in finding new pathologies during folloup is impresive. Few comments: 1. References in the text should be listed properly, in a similar way 2. In discussion please delete the data from results, and concentrate on the importance of PET-PDG in finding new pathologies during the follow-up.