

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Oncology Research Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AORJ_127783
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comparative Study to Evaluate the Efficacy and Toxicities of Hypofractionated Radiotherapy Vs Conventional Radiotherapy in Advanced Carcinoma Cervix
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

#### **PART 1: Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Title of this topic has significant relevance in the current context due to high incidence of cancer in south Asia among women. Various hypo-fractionated regime were followed for Ca.Uterine cervix in reducing overall treatment time, cost and improving throughout with limited resource.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Is Hypofractionation an alternative to Conventional radiotherapy in Carcinoma Uterine Cervix	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract is very vague and needs revision	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes. Preparation of manuscript not up-to the standards	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Not adequate. Important trails were missed. Like IAEA trail, Embrace trial, RTOG trial	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Absolutely not. Request author to use Grammarly software to make manuscript more readable	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>Overall English language needs to be improved.</b>  <b>Depth understanding of various trails and outcome is important for the manuscript preparation.</b></p> <p><b>No Inclusion and Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p><b>Detailing of protocol followed for contouring is missing</b></p> <p><b>Treatment delivery, Planning strategies not mentioned</b></p> <p><b>Different hypofractionation regime is followed by different researchers, what made authors to decide this particular dose schedule.</b></p> <p><b>Concurrent Chemo is a standard of care for carcinoma uterine cervix, whether this is followed in both the groups. If so, mention the schedule?</b></p> <p><b>Dosimetric data for both Targets and OARs are not evaluated and compared</b></p> <p><b>VMAT shown to reduce dose to bowel and bladder and reduce acute adverse effect viz.,</b>  <b>Diarrhoea</b></p> <p><b>Toxicity evaluation were not well defined</b></p> <p><b>Whether QOL was assessed, if so, what protocol followed for treatment outcome and survival</b></p> <p><b>Which test were used to evaluate p value for Statistical comparison (Parametric or Non-parametric test)</b></p> <p><b>Sample size is minimum to conclude the outcome of the study. As this is most common disease.</b></p> <p><b>Was follow-up carried out at regular interval (If so, mention the schedule and methods used to evaluate outcome of both the groups.</b></p> <p><b>Reputed and most recent citation should be quoted. (Eg. GEC-ESTRO, RTOG)</b></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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Mourougan Sinnatamby</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>JIPMER, India</b></p>