



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: editorialoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Radiology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 11212

**Title:** Impact of dose calculation algorithm on radiation therapy

**Reviewer code:** 00289583

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2014-05-09 19:42

**Date reviewed:** 2014-06-23 20:30

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper reviewed the dose calculation algorithms used in radiation therapy and the clinical impact. The topic focused on the impact of dose calculation algorithms on TCP and NTCP, is of interest. The paper is well written. It is a good review paper and worth publishing.



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: editorialoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Radiology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 11212

**Title:** Impact of dose calculation algorithm on radiation therapy

**Reviewer code:** 00289583

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2014-05-09 19:42

**Date reviewed:** 2014-06-23 20:30

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is of importance and interest to the readers of the journal. It is written in good English. However, it does not comply with the standard requirements of a Review, to be found in:

“The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate healthcare interventions: explanation and elaboration”

By A. Liberati et al, BMJ 2009;339:b2700

The Abstract lacks of Results and Methods.

In Introduction, second paragraph, several references are missing.

There should be a session with the search strategy, databases searched, inclusion/exclusion criteria of the papers included in the Review, and the dates of the articles include on the search, for example: up to May 2014.

The article lacks figures. At least illustrations of the methods/algorithms on block diagrams should be included.

There are important data non-reported, which are essential for the review: for example, population/sample to which each method has been applied, the types of tumours (are all lung tumours?), analyses of other factors, for example the size of the tumours studied and the quality measure to evaluate the efficacy of the algorithm.

Section 3 should be divided into subsections.

Overall, although the manuscript is an effort to give information about the impact of dose calculation algorithm on radiation therapy, the message is not clear to the readers and, therefore, it lacks quality.