

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 19510

Title: Pelvic radiation therapy: Between delight and disaster

Reviewer's code: 00742244

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-05-11 17:29

Date reviewed: 2015-06-02 17:39

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

ESPS Manuscript 19510 This is a review paper on Pelvic radiation therapy. The manuscript is well written and presents in a clear way the advantages (delight) and the disadvantages (disaster) of RT. The only comment for the authors if they can present more extensively in a subheading the damage on the pelvic nerves and how they can affect the functionality of the anorectum.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 19510

Title: Pelvic radiation therapy: Between delight and disaster

Reviewer's code: 00505458

Reviewer's country: Germany

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-05-11 17:29

Date reviewed: 2015-05-13 19:23

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Crucial point for decision making is the risk-benefit ratio for the patient. Benefit should be prolonged survival, the risk a low rate of PRD, and all this in relation to the options of alternatives. The PRD is of great importance, however has to be put into the context, whether it is worth to take the risk, or whether it is possible to reduce the risk, or to treat the complications? "Three times as many people survive cancer than 30 years ago largely as a result of the increasingly potent, multi-modality treatment regimes." What was the benefit, how long was the improvement?