



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

Manuscript NO: 53987

Title: National Comprehensive Cancer Network guidelines compliance of a sarcoma service: A retrospective review

Reviewer's code: 02953796

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2020-02-20

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-02-22 05:25

Reviewer performed review: 2020-02-22 06:14

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

World Journal of Clinical Oncology 22 February 2020 Manuscript ID: Reviewer's Code: 02953796 " National Comprehensive Cancer Network(NCCN) Guidelines Compliance of a Sarcoma Service: a Retrospective Review" Dear editorial Teams This is well design article . However, I have several suggestions that I think would improve the quality of research: a) The aim of study well is not stated? Is this validation study ? b) Structurally article as introduction, Methods, results, and Discussion should be amended and revised. Is this retrospective or prospective study? c) Given the sample size compared to Guideline sample , and patients groups in the study, the findings cannot be confirmed as conclusive? d) Explain and discuss what the research adds to what is already known? e) In Conclusion section, the Conclusion should be expressed only? f) Which patients of Sarcoma benefit from this study? please discuss? Please explain applications this study in future? Parisa Azimi, MD,