

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 72512

Title: Current status and future of Targeted Peptide Receptor Radionuclide Positron Emission Tomography Imaging and Therapy of Gastroenteropancreatic-Neuroendocrine Tumors

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05906378

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-10-19

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-10-19 07:03

Reviewer performed review: 2021-10-21 02:33

Review time: 1 Day and 19 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	 [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection



Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Current status and future directions of Targeted Peptide Receptor Radionuclide PET Imaging and Therapy of GEP-NETs World Journal of Gastroenterology Minor comments Abstract: 1.In the word well differentiated, hyphen should be placed. 2.In the last sentence, no need of comma after the word development. Background: 1.In the second line comma should be placed (body, which) 2.In 2nd paragraph omit the which is (which is based on) 3.In the last paragraph of the background, add comma (in this paper,) DOTATATE PET Imaging 1.In first sentence replace the word which by that. 2.Replace (The first imaging agents) by (The earlier imaging agents) Technique 1.Replace (prior to) by (Before) 2.Replace the word same by exact Normal Biodistribution 1.Use the suitable article before unbound 2.Remove comma after variable (variable,) Imaging Performance 1.Replace "a very low" by " a deficient" 2.Replace the sentence "Another cause of false negatives, as seen in all of PET imaging, may arise from small lesions that are below PET resolution" by "Another cause of false negatives, as seen in PET imaging, may arise from small lesions below PET resolution" 3.Replace "extremely high" by "highly" 4.Replace the sentence "Very small lesions can be readily visualized in both phantom and patient clinical studies if the background activity is low" by "Small lesions can be readily visualized in phantom and patient clinical studies if the background activity is low" Role in Evaluation and Value in Management 1.Replace "evaluation of" by "evaluating" 2."111In pentetreotide and to CT or MR is well established" omit "to" 64Cu DOTATATE 1.Replace "compare to" by "than" 2.Replace "contribute to improved" by "improve" 3.Replace the sentence



"Finally, pre-clinical studies of new investigational agents, such as 55Co DOTATATE, are showing the potential for yet further improvements in tumor uptake and image contrast when compared to currently approved agents" by "Finally, preclinical studies of new investigational agents, such as 55Co DOTATATE, show the potential for further improvements in tumor uptake and image contrast compared to currently approved agents"



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 72512

Title: Current status and future of Targeted Peptide Receptor Radionuclide Positron Emission Tomography Imaging and Therapy of Gastroenteropancreatic-Neuroendocrine Tumors

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03711713

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Netherlands

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-10-19

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-10-26 08:47

Reviewer performed review: 2021-10-26 10:20

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	 [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection



Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors, Congratulations with your well written review article regarding GEP-nets. I only have some minor revisions. Kind regards,