

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Research Journal of Oncology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_IRJO_117686
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Abdominal Aortic Bifurcation Level in Pelvic Cancer Patients Undergoing Radiotherapy: A Retrospective CT-Based Analysis
Type of the 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.journalirjo.com/index.php/IRJO/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Definitely, this manuscript adds to scientific community, with providing data to optimize radiotherapy in the treatment of pelvic cancers.</p> <p>The title is misleading as results didn't compare radiotherapy's results. However, CT scan images were reviewed to determine aortic bifurcation level to optimize further radiotherapy's target field. Thus, I suggest replacing assessment with "usage".</p> <p>The abstract is well structured delivering important results.</p> <p>The manuscript is well structured as well, with a specific focus on methodology.</p> <p>The manuscript was correctly elaborated.</p> <p>References are pertinent and up-to-date.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>There are no grammar or vocabulary errors.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>This work can be furtherer enriched by providing results on the studied on population: oncological results: recurrences and survival after treatment, and whether or not aortic bifurcation influenced these results (taking into account that radiation target field was uniform.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mseddi Mohamed Ali</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>La Rabta Hospital, Tunisia</b>