

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Oncology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AORJ_91974
Title of the Manuscript:	A comparative study between two different fractionation of High Dose Rate Brachytherapy in locally advanced carcinoma of Uterine Cervix after pelvic concurrent Chemoradiotherapy
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	The statement "Statistical analysis revealed there was no significant difference but arithmetically this is proven that Arm-A patients had better response than Arm-B" should be revised in the observation & results section as well as in the discussion. If there is no statistically significant difference, it should be stated as so. There is no proof that Arm A patients responded better Arm B.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	None	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	None	

### 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)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Daniella Akellot
Department, University & Country	CoRSU Rehabilitation Hospital, Uganda