

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Oncology Research Journal
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	Research 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>

Review Form 3

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.	The article is essential in light of radiation therapy to treat cervical cancer patients. Conventional radiotherapy has some negative impacts on patients. More compact radiation is given to the patients to minimize the toxicity effects. But traditional radiotherapy like proton, and hadron therapy have a severe impact on patients. The short-time hypofractionated radiotherapy shows less toxicity in several cases like urological toxicity, skin toxicity etc. Conventional fractionated radiotherapy needs more radiation doses and has adverse effects on the patients.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title should be - "Comparative Analysis of Hypo fractionated Radiotherapy Vs Conventional Radiotherapy in Advanced Cervical Carcinoma in view of Therapeutic Efficacy and toxicity"	
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.	Requires type of radiation therapy whether it is high energy transfer (high – LET) or low energy transfer radiation (Low – LET). Invitro cervical cancer cell lines like HeLa etc. it should be justified.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The current manuscript is scientifically correct but needs some modification. Conventional radiation therapy requires high doses, but hypo-fractionated radiation doses showed less toxicity among patients. There is not mentioned which types of therapy High linear energy transfer (High – LET) or linear energy transfer beam(LET).	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Needs more references for comparative analysis of conventional radiotherapy as well as hypo fractionated radiotherapy.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is okay	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	No comments	

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:	Mriganka Mandal
Department, University & Country	Dr. Kanailal Bhattacharyya College, The University of Calcutta, India