

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_84910
Title of the Manuscript:	18F-FES PET CT Scan in Patients Of Histopathologically Proven Estrogen Positive Breast Carcinoma at aTertiary Care Facility
Type of the Article	Case report

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This manuscript is interesting. I have a few comments for the Authors.</p> <p>-In abstract, methodology, there are too much details relative to PET CT acquisition; this informations, in the abstract session, should be restricted.</p> <p>-introduction, first line, is reported: BCa (BCa). This should be changed in Breast Carcinoma (BCa).</p> <p>-Also, in introduction, should be reported the full name of the radiotracer ¹⁸F-FES: ¹⁸F-fluoroestradiol (¹⁸F-FES).</p> <p>-Results and discussion: in the figures 1, 2 and 3 the 18F-FES uptake seems intense; it is not clear how the SUVmax reported for the lesions is very low (SUVmax: 1, 4 and 2.2).</p>	<p>Thanks for the comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The abstract has been modified in the light of comments from the reviewer and PET-CT acquisition detail has been shortened.- Introduction, First line is corrected accordingly.- Correction is incorporated.- Figures are showing intense tracer uptake because we have increased the intensity of image to show primary as well as ER positive metastatic lesions as physiological uptake in the liver and gut is very high.- SUV values have been corrected as 2.4 and 3.2
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	