

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 16636

Title: Combined value of apparent diffusion coefficient-standardized uptake value max in evaluation of post-treated locally advanced rectal cancer

Reviewer's code: 00289440

Reviewer's country: Iran

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-01-26 11:58

Date reviewed: 2015-01-29 13:19

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input 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"/> 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

According to manuscript Number 16636 Manuscript, entitled "Magnetic Resonance (MR) imaging and FDG-PET/CT evaluation of Locally Advanced Rectal Cancer after neoadjuvant radiochemotherapy: predictive Value of Combined ADC and SUV in assessing TRG" it is a novel, practical, well written manuscript. IN FIG LEGEND PART, THE PATIENTS' AGES ARE NOT MENTIONED.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 16636

Title: Combined value of apparent diffusion coefficient-standardized uptake value max in evaluation of post-treated locally advanced rectal cancer

Reviewer's code: 02348457

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-01-26 11:58

Date reviewed: 2015-01-29 22:34

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input 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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	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

1. MR images were analyzed and ADC measurements were made by one radiologist. PET Images were interpreted by one experienced nuclear medicine physicians. Why did not these two doctors assess images together and in consensus? 2. Figure 1, 2, what is the age of the patient? 3. Figure 3, please add the unit to the ADC. 4. Figure 4, Please add a ROC graph for the combined model of the regression analysis