

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5866

Title: Stereotactic body radiotherapy for oligometastasis from colorectal cancer

Reviewer code: 02451544

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-09-29 14:27

Date reviewed: 2013-10-06 15:56

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" 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	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper is interesting. Stereotactic body radiotherapy is useful. Colon and rectum are not the same, stereotactic body radiotherapy Are valid, please discuss it.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5866

Title: Stereotactic body radiotherapy for oligometastasis from colorectal cancer

Reviewer code: 00225366

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-09-29 14:27

Date reviewed: 2013-11-25 23:41

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	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

This work is a review about using the stereotactic body radiotherapy technique to treat oligometastasis from colorectal cancer. The authors used a lot of spaces to review and discuss colorectal cancer and different treatment outcomes due to various treatment techniques. This work is thorough and comprehensive. It should provide important information to the reader of the journal. However, I think the authors may want to change the title of this work as it mainly focused on the review and recent study results of oligometastasis from colorectal cancer. It does not actually focus on the technique and delivery in stereotactic body radiotherapy, which are interested in by some readers.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5866

Title: Stereotactic body radiotherapy for oligometastasis from colorectal cancer

Reviewer code: 02510166

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-09-29 14:27

Date reviewed: 2013-11-26 05:53

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)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is well written. Minor remarks. 1) There are some typos?: ?idoseose? (in Tables). 2) Fractionation times are not reported. Were the fractions delivered daily, or once weekly, or once monthly? 3) The tables' layouts are not optimal. a) Links to the references are missing. Suggestion: add reference number. b) The columns "total dose/fraction and prescription" mix two different classes of information, and treatment times are missing. Suggestion: split into two separate columns, one column for dose/fraction/time, and one column for prescription specification. c) Some cells are excessively cluttered and are inconsistently organized. If a published series used different fractionation schedules, one row should be allocated to each fractionation schedule. This was so done in the manuscript regarding 2011 Rule and 2011 Vautravers, but was inconsistent regarding 2006 Wulf. 4) Discussions: should provide insight on why the series are small.