

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 32410

Title: Performance of 18-fluoro-2-deoxyglucose positron emission tomography for esophageal cancer screening

Reviewer's code: 03362724

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2017-01-09 08:44

Date reviewed: 2017-01-11 14:55

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is well designed. Although it is known that PET-CT is not used for screening of the EC, as the aauthor mentioned, limited data are available on the performance of FDG-PET the EC screening. It is documented with this study. The limitations were stated clearly. The number of the patients in this study, is really good enough for the best results.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 32410

Title: Performance of 18-fluoro-2-deoxyglucose positron emission tomography for esophageal cancer screening

Reviewer's code: 02446450

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2017-01-09 08:44

Date reviewed: 2017-02-06 23:31

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors investigate the value of PET for screening an asymptomatic population for oesophageal cancer. This is a retrospective analysis involving 8438 subjects. Only 28 cases of oesophageal cancer were identified. Only 1 on these tumours was apparent on PET. 51 individuals had PET uptake in the oesophagus. 1 one these was due to tumour, the remainder were benign. The authors conclude that PET has a very low sensitivity and PPV for detecting oesophageal cancer in an asymptomatic population. This is a nicely written paper from Japan. Due to the low sensitivity/PPV the authors conclude that PET is not a useful tool for screening for oesophageal cancer. The authors acknowledge that this is most likely due to the small size of lesions within an asymptomatic population. The study is well conducted and well thought through. The results are clearly presented and the conclusions are sensible. Although the results are 'negative' I think the conclusions are useful. One error - line 3, page 11: 'esophagostomy' should be 'esophagectomy'