

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Oncology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AORJ_94035
Title of the Manuscript:	CRANIOSPINAL IRRADIATION USING THREE-DIMENSIONAL CONFORMAL RADIOTHERAPY WITH TWO DIFFERENT PLANNING TECHNIQUES: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS IN SUPINE AND PRONE POSITIONS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.journalaorj.com/index.php/AORJ/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		
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">The author must reformulate the conclusion of the abstract because we couldn't conclude that on a study of 6 cases on the other hand the conclusion of the article is very logical	
Optional/General comments	<p>It is very interesting dosimetric study, I can add some comments:</p> <p>We can compare two plans for the same position for every position but we cannot compare the superiority for position in this study except if each patient had a CT scan in one position then the other (supine and prone)</p>	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ahmedou Tolba
Department, University & Country	Centre National d'oncologie, Mauritania