

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS manuscript NO: 16736

Title: The evolving role of salvage reirradiation: Is global harmonization required before treatment guidelines can be developed?

Reviewer's code: 01430813

Reviewer's country: Brazil

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-01-28 14:20

Date reviewed: 2015-02-08 02:37

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

This is a good paper that provides some interesting insights on a very controversial and poorly understood therapeutical alternative. It give us something to think about.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS manuscript NO: 16736

Title: The evolving role of salvage reirradiation: Is global harmonization required before treatment guidelines can be developed?

Reviewer's code: 00742250

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-01-28 14:20

Date reviewed: 2015-01-31 15:57

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

This review article has a scientific value to be published in the World Journal of Meta-Analysis. It will contribute to the clinical practice of the readers of the journal.