



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 86572

Title: Evaluation of Toxicity and Survival of Patients with Multiple Brain Metastases Treated with Isolated Radiosurgery

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03017455

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2023-06-27

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-06-28 04:30

Reviewer performed review: 2023-07-03 14:07

Review time: 5 Days and 9 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

An interesting and meaningful study on evaluating the effect of isolated radiosurgery treatment on patients with multiple brain metastases (four or more lesions). The authors retrospectively collected data of the eligible study population in a single institution (N = 55). The Spearman’s rank coefficients, Mann-Whitney test, Kruskal-Wallis test, and Log-rank test were conducted. Although interesting and meaningful, there are some problems in the manuscript. 1. Line 65-66, there seems to be some typing omissions in “10 months (8.9 months)” and “3.6 months for KPS 70 (P = 0.047)”. 2. There is necessary to perform appropriate statistical tests on all the results and add corresponding p-values in the presentation of the results. 3. The population of this study is small and the results could be more convincing if including more patients from another institution. 4. For brain metastasis in the Introduction and Discussion parts, some important ref. must be cited, such as, PMID 36991428, 36529697.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 86572

Title: Evaluation of Toxicity and Survival of Patients with Multiple Brain Metastases Treated with Isolated Radiosurgery

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03322877

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, MSc

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2023-06-27

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-07-28 15:33

Reviewer performed review: 2023-07-31 06:48

Review time: 2 Days and 15 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

-Are both groups suitable for comparison (age, gender, diagnosis, location and number of metastases)? -Have the patients received other treatments other than SRS (radiotherapy or chemotherapy)? -Has SRS always been applied by the same researchers? Initials of their names should be given in the method section. -Has a multivariate analysis been performed to eliminate confounding factors?



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 86572

Title: Evaluation of Toxicity and Survival of Patients with Multiple Brain Metastases Treated with Isolated Radiosurgery

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03711713

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Netherlands

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2023-06-27

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-07-27 13:20

Reviewer performed review: 2023-08-06 18:22

Review time: 10 Days and 5 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors, Congratulations with the article "Evaluation of Toxicity and Survival of Patients with Multiple Brain Metastases Treated with Isolated Radiosurgery". However I do have some major concerns: 1. Methods - patient selection: Please be more elaborate about patient selection criteria, were only 55 patients treated during August 2017 en february 2020? probably not, did you exclude patients from your study? why? If necessary make a flow chart regarding patient selection. This to show any patient selection bias 2. Table 1 - 53 patients? --> should this be 55 patients? please check this. or otherwise make this clear in the patient selection section. 3. Table 1 - KPS is 34, but there are 35 patients? why is 1 missing? please look into this! 4. Also the two groups do not contain an euqal amount of patients. It doesn't feel like a good comparison, also taking into account point 2. and point 3.