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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This study evaluated the clinical significance of incidental focal colorectal FDG uptake on F-18 FDG PET/CT in the diagnosis of colorectal malignant/premalignant lesions. The detection rate of incidental focal colorectal uptake was 0.53% and 61% of the eligible lesions were malignant or premalignant. The authors concluded that SUV max was an independent diagnostic parameter for malignant/premalignant lesions, and suspicious focal colorectal FDG uptake requires attention and further evaluation. This paper was well written with appropriate methodology and appealing images. This paper may be strengthened if the following points were considered for further review. Specific points:

1. Population bias: Since this study analyzed the individuals undergoing PET/CT under presence/suspicious of hypermetabolic pathologies, these group of patients may have increased incidence of malignancy compared to general population. In addition, this study excluded the individuals for whom histopathological reports were not available (or not confirmed). These issues can be added to the “limitations.”

2. Redundant paragraph: The 5th paragraph (starting with “Among the 24 malignant lesions,...”) discussed about sidedness of colorectal lesions. The discussion was based on the findings of only 24 malignant lesions found incidentally on PET/CT, therefore, the comparison to other large epidemiologic data may be less meaningful. The authors may be advised to shorten or omit this paragraph.
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1. How was the sample size determined? Was there power to detect differences?
2. Why reschedule the examination time for cases with blood glucose level ≥ 11 mmol/L?
   Is there any literature support?
3. The highlights of the results are not so prominent. The comparison between the images and tables in the results is confusing, so it is suggested to consider using the appendix for display.
4. Language needs polishing.
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The revised manuscript is well written, and the authors have adequately responded to the reviewers' queries with sufficient references.