

## 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

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

#### **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,