Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] 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.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[　] Grade A: Excellent　　[Y] Grade B: Good　　　[　] Grade C: Fair [　] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing　[　] Grade B: Minor language polishing　[　] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing　[　] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[　] Accept (High priority)　[　] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision　[　] Major revision　[　] Rejection
Re-review	[　] Yes　[Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous　[　] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [　] Yes　[Y] 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?

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent　　[ ] Grade B: Very good　　[ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair　　[Y] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent　　[ ] Grade B: Good　　[Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent　　[ ] Grade B: Good　　[ ] Grade C: Fair [Y] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] 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.