

Reviewers' comments:

Reviewer code 03737603:

Dear Editor, thank you that you asked me to review the manuscript. The authors worked hard and produced an interesting work. The value of the study would have been increased if the authors write a methods section and describe their systematic search of the literature and which databases have been searched

We thank the Reviewer for the kind remarks. With specific regard to his/her comment, we refrained from adding a methods section to our manuscript since it is not a “systematic review” of the literature. Indeed, this article is targeted for the column “Review” of World Journal of Gastroenterology, which does not require a “Methods” section. Accordingly, in our work we aimed to take an in-depth, all-encompassing but not systematic approach to search the literature on parametric imaging of colorectal cancer. Several key words were used on the search engine PubMed. The English paper selection was based on several factors, ranging from journals’ impact factor to sample size as well as year of publication (more recent articles were preferred due to the importance of technological advancement in our field). We also strived to include conflicting evidences when they occurred. Obviously, if the inclusion of a method section is considered mandatory for acceptance, we are willing to add it to the text reporting the above mentioned information.

Reviewer code 03478911:

The use of FDG-PET/CT in the diagnosis of primary CRC is not consistent with recent trends unless it is aimed at tracking metastasis. If the authors have a pure purpose in measuring the extent of cancer metabolism, it will be suggested to introduce the part that FDG-PET/CT is used for the screening of anticancer drugs that directly target cancer specific metabolism.

We agree with the Reviewer that currently the use of FDG-PET/CT is not recommended for the diagnosis of primary CRC. Indeed, in the section entitled “limitations, potential and effective clinical applications of parametric imaging analysis”, we included the following statement: “there is not enough scientific evidence to recommend the routine use of quantitative FDG-PET/CT in the identification and/or local staging of the primary CRC”. However, for the sake of comprehensiveness, we decided to discuss all relevant papers we found for the hybrid imaging sections, including those regarding the assessment of primary CRC.

The potential role of PET/CT for the screening of anticancer drugs represents an interesting topic, however the manuscripts published in English literature are primarily based on animal models or on non-FDG PET radiotracers. Consequently, we have refrained from discussing the proposed topic in our review.

Reviewer code 02944288:

Good article. It's better to show conclusion (at least partly) in the abstract.

We thank the Reviewer for the valuable suggestion. Accordingly, we have modified the abstract in the revised version of our manuscript in order to briefly present the conclusion of our work.

Reviewer code 03004110:

I appreciate the effort done by the Authors. The paper can be considered for publication.

We thank the Reviewer for the positive comments.