

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7081

Title: Cost-effectiveness of Fluorine-18-Fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography in tumours other than lung cancer: a systematic review

Reviewer code: 00289563

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2013-11-04 15:21

Date reviewed: 2013-11-05 03:05

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"/> 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)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This study is well designed and well done. The authors also realized and pointed out that the literature is limited on the cancer types studies in this article. The English writing is excellent. In the two paragraphs (Page 5-6, Ref 27 and 28), authors only pointed out that PET/CT dominated other strategies. However, no specific values or QALYs were provided. If these numbers are not available in the original publications, authors should pointed out.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7081

Title: Cost-effectiveness of Fluorine-18-Fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography in tumours other than lung cancer: a systematic review

Reviewer code: 00227360

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2013-11-04 15:21

Date reviewed: 2013-11-18 21:41

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 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)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The author presented a review on the cost-effectiveness of Fluorine-18-Fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography (FDG-PET) or PET/computed tomography (PET/CT) in tumours other than lung cancer. However, a main drawback hinders the immediate publication of the manuscript: the content in the discussion is weak in the sense of science, the author only list the published works in a descriptive way, no instructive analysis was done or summary indexes derived from the literature were compared, and more importantly, no statistic analysis was performed. Therefore, it is suggested to revise the manuscript according to the comments above.