

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 14741

**Title:** The prognostic value and clinical correlations of 18-fluorodeoxyglucose metabolism quantifiers in gastric cancer.

**Reviewer code:** 02548806

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2014-10-27 19:14

**Date reviewed:** 2014-10-30 06:12

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 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

Abstract: The result subsection of the abstract should be shortened

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 14741

**Title:** The prognostic value and clinical correlations of 18-fluorodeoxyglucose metabolism quantifiers in gastric cancer.

**Reviewer code:** 00061154

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2014-10-27 19:14

**Date reviewed:** 2014-11-27 10:32

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 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

This is an excellent paper. However, there are far too many "the"s. I have taken the liberty of deleting some without interfering with the integrity of your paper. Do not give the first author's name when citing a reference because it is distracting. Only use the reference number. Captions do not require full sentences. I have asked a few questions.

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 14741

**Title:** The prognostic value and clinical correlations of 18-fluorodeoxyglucose metabolism quantifiers in gastric cancer.

**Reviewer code:** 00042490

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2014-10-27 19:14

**Date reviewed:** 2014-12-01 11:02

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 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	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

The major problems of this study were two. 1. Patients enrolled were divided into two subgroups. One was with locoregional disease (n=23) and the other was with tumor dissemination (n=17). Outcomes measure used in this study were time-to-metastasis and overall survival. I have at least two concerns. First, for those with tumor dissemination, how to calculate "time-to-metastasis" in those already had disseminated disease? Second, how to confirm the event of "tumor dissemination into distant organ"? There is no wonder why there is no any information regarding "time-to-metastasis" and only had "overall survival" data in this study. 2. As we all know that outcomes of gastric cancer patients were much worse in those with disease dissemination than with locoregional disease alone. In this study, table 3 showed that almost all the metabolic quantifiers, including TLG30 ( $p=0.018$ ), were significantly higher in those with disseminated disease than with locoregional alone. Therefore, it was not surprised that TLG30 with cutoff value of 319.4 cm<sup>3</sup> showed significant predictor for overall survival. I wonder whether or not most of the gastric cancer patients with disease dissemination were located in the subgroup of TLG30>319.4 cm<sup>3</sup>? If so, what was the major reason for poor outcomes, TLG or disease dissemination? To clarify the above two questions, I suggest authors to delete 17 disseminated cases, keeping the original two end points to analyze these 23 locoregional cases again to see whether or not TLG still is an independent prognosticator.