

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Cancer and Tumor International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JCTI_99912
Title of the Manuscript:	RE-IRRADIATION IN HEAD AND NECK SQUAMOUS CELL CARCINOMA – A SINGLE INSTITUTE EXPERIENCE
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.journaljcti.com/index.php/JCTI/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>[Note 1] The study is important for society, especially for India and developing countries, where cancer indicators are increasing and crowding already insufficient radiotherapy departments. In many countries thousands of patients stop receiving radiotherapy due to lack of structure, and re-irradiation is a reality that causes the patient to return to the waiting line.</p> <p>[Note 2] The title of the study is in accordance with what was proposed by the authors, and its objective is already implicit.</p> <p>[Note 3] The authors were happy to highlight the state of the art in the abstract, making the justification and methodology clear from the beginning.</p> <p>[Note 4] The sub-items of the work bring the high technology employed today in radiotherapy and fundamental concepts in modern radiotherapy treatment, I suggest an approach regarding the medulla PRV, it could bring information about radiation doses for further studies.</p> <p>[Note 5] The study brings great responsibility to radiotherapy departments as well as interdisciplinary team and those delivering the radiation dose, as the tolerance of the marrow is considerably lower than the prescribed dose from the first phase of treatment, thus a re irradiation requires high technology as at the core of the study and great in depth advocacy for all involved for patient safety and effective treatment rescue.</p> <p>[Note 6] The literature reference is sufficient to complement the statistical study, as well as the computer program much employed in these studies to assist in the results and discussions, which was satisfactory.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The study presents a technical language, but clear and objective in the text that reaches the majority of readers as undergraduate and post-graduate students, which can serve as a means of disseminating the technology currently employed in the practice of radiotherapy, an area that requires precision, reproducibility, and is dependent on high technology to reduce local recurrence after treatment.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The sample size could be larger due to availability of access or the high rates of recurrent patients, but it can be considered a more recent data generating study compared to the literature and highlights at this center are the high technology available, practical and effective clinical data of prescribed dose and dose in ORs.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Thiago Victorino Claus
Department, University & Country	Franciscan University, Brazil