

# **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: 7946** 

Title: Radiation pneumonitis after stereotactic radiation therapy for lung tumors: a review of the

current literature

Reviewer code: 02837227

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2013-12-08 15:32

Date reviewed: 2014-01-24 00:55

| CLASSIFICATION          | LANGUAGE EVALUATION                    | RECOMMENDATION | CONCLUSION            |
|-------------------------|--|----------------|-----------------------|
| [ ] Grade A (Excellent) | [ ] Grade A: Priority Publishing       | Google Search: | [Y] Accept            |
| [ ] Grade B (Very good) | [ Y] Grade B: minor language polishing | [ ] Existed    | [ ] High priority for |
| [Y] Grade C (Good)      | [ ] Grade C: a great deal of           | [ ] No records | publication           |
| [ ] Grade D (Fair)      | language polishing                     | BPG Search:    | [ ]Rejection          |
| [ ] Grade E (Poor)      | [ ] Grade D: rejected                  | [ ] Existed    | [ ] Minor revision    |
|                         |  | [ ] No records | [ ] Major revision    |

### **COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Manuscript ID: 01446077 of World Journal of Radiology Title: Radiation pneumonitis after stereotactic radiation therapy for lung tumors: a review of the current literature. The study is on stereotactic body radiation therapy (SBRT) and the formation percentage of Radiation pneumonitis (RP), the most common toxicities after SBRT. The author gave some researches from literature on these subjects, however; the author did not detailed his research. In my opinion, the study is not enough to be published.



# **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:** 7946

Title: Radiation pneumonitis after stereotactic radiation therapy for lung tumors: a review of the

current literature

Reviewer code: 00225335

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2013-12-08 15:32

**Date reviewed:** 2014-02-10 11:16

| CLASSIFICATION          | LANGUAGE EVALUATION                    | RECOMMENDATION | CONCLUSION             |
|-------------------------|--|----------------|------------------------|
| [ ] Grade A (Excellent) | [ ] Grade A: Priority Publishing       | Google Search: | [ ] Accept             |
| [Y] Grade B (Very good) | [ Y] Grade B: minor language polishing | [ ] Existed    | [ Y] High priority for |
| [ ] Grade C (Good)      | [ ] Grade C: a great deal of           | [ ] No records | publication            |
| [ ] Grade D (Fair)      | language polishing                     | BPG Search:    | [ ]Rejection           |
| [ ] Grade E (Poor)      | [ ] Grade D: rejected                  | [ ] Existed    | [ ] Minor revision     |
|                         |  | [ ] No records | [ ] Major revision     |
|                         |  |                |                        |

### **COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The paper is acceptable for publication, pending minor revision. Page 5, abbreviation of SBRT has been given in the previous paragraph, so suggest deleting it. Page 6, subtle" Local control rare of SBRT" should be corrected to "Local control rate of SBRT".



### 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: 7946

Title: Radiation pneumonitis after stereotactic radiation therapy for lung tumors: a review of the

current literature

**Reviewer code:** 00713469 **Science editor:** Ling-Ling Wen

**Date sent for review:** 2013-12-08 15:32

Date reviewed: 2014-02-13 21:05

| CLASSIFICATION          | LANGUAGE EVALUATION                    | RECOMMENDATION | CONCLUSION            |
|-------------------------|--|----------------|-----------------------|
| [ ] Grade A (Excellent) | [ ] Grade A: Priority Publishing       | Google Search: | [ ] Accept            |
| [ ] Grade B (Very good) | [ Y] Grade B: minor language polishing | [ ] Existed    | [ ] High priority for |
| [ ] Grade C (Good)      | [ ] Grade C: a great deal of           | [ ] No records | publication           |
| [Y] Grade D (Fair)      | language polishing                     | BPG Search:    | [Y]Rejection          |
| [ ] Grade E (Poor)      | [ ] Grade D: rejected                  | [ ] Existed    | [ ] Minor revision    |
|                         |  | [ ] No records | [ ] Major revision    |
|                         |  |                |                       |

#### **COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The authors present a review on the possible influence of various factors on the induced actinic pneumonitis (RP) after stereotactic radiation therapy (SBRT) for lung tumors. The design and the aim of the study appear both not innovative and of the potential interest for the readers. RP constitutes the most common toxicity after SBRT and usually is grade 2, thus not severe. Do the topic is so important? First, it is vague and confusing the writing methodology arising from the whole manuscript. Incidentally, is not clear what is what throughout the paper. Moreover, the percentages reported concerning some of the previous studies mentioned appear not related to any number of patients enrolled, which translates inaccuracy. We were wondering in accepting the possible impact of the cited biomarkers, since it is unclear the patho-physiological mechanisms that sustain their role in RP. Finally, as a review it should be consistent with a manual, which is not the case. Abstract, introduction and discussion repeat blindly the same sentences. We strongly believe that there is the lack of a validate background on which weave a good revision. English is poor and does not translate adequately the message. A lot of type errors as well as acronyms not appropriately defined.