

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_119849
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Seroma Volume Reduction on Dosimetry in Whole Breast Radiation Therapy: A Case Study and Adaptive Planning Considerations
Type of the Article	Case report

Review Form 1.7

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><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Seroma has been a common complication occurring after a breast cancer conservative surgery, which is known to complicate radiation planning. By considering the clinical significant and proven effectiveness of radiation therapy following lumpectomy or mastectomy, this manuscript is very important to the scientific community. It added new knowledge on the application of different radiotherapy techniques in achieving a better plans optimization, and as well evaluates the impacts of seroma volume reduction on the dosage of radiation absorbed by breast tissues in post-operative breast cancer surgery.</p> <p>The title of the article is suitable and it corresponded well with the aims and objectives of the case study, which highlighted the impact of seroma volume changes on dosimetry during whole breast radiotherapy.</p> <p>The abstract is very comprehensive, coherent, concise, and informative based, with a good clinical context. It covers the case and clinical presentation of the female patient, the discussion and conclusion, which highlighted the importance of whole breast radiotherapy planning in optimizing treatment accuracy, patient safety and patient outcome.</p> <p>The manuscript is well structured with appropriate sections, tables and diagrams that highlighted a detailed comparison of various radiotherapy techniques, that provided a good quality treatment plan that was assessed through various dosimetry parameters.</p> <p>Scientifically, the manuscript is correct. It contains an informative introduction, case report, discussion and conclusion. The case report findings highlighted the advantages of advanced radiotherapy therapy over conventional RT, and when combined with adaptive planning, can optimised and improve the treatment outcome, with a significant reduction on seroma activity.</p> <p>The references were sufficient and follow a general format rules for citation and references on case studies report. Only one reference year (1991) was outdated. Overall, the references provided a good supportive evidence on the introductory and discussion sections of the case study.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The English quality of the article is very suitable for scholarly communication, and it provided an in-depth understanding of the case study and clinical findings, that will be important and accessible by the scientific community.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</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:	Ugochukwu O. Maluze
Department, University & Country	University of Sydney, Australia