

Manuscript: **“Dose Variation To Critical Points In Low Dose Rate Intracavitary Brachytherapy Of Cervical Cancer As Justification For Incident Learning”**

Submitted: 22 November 2021

Accepted: 26 December 2021

Published: 31 January 2022

Corresponding Author: Eric Clement Desmond Kotei Addison

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n03p48](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n03p48)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Fatjona Kamberi

Reviewer 2:

Reviewer 3:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

Fatjona Kamberi

Once this review has been read, press "Confirm" to indicate that the review process may proceed. If the reviewer has submitted their review elsewhere, you may upload the file below and then press "Confirm" to proceed.

Completed: 2021-11-23 05:09 PM

Recommendation: Revisions Required

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

***yes**

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

***yes**

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

yes

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Partly. The paper has problems in particular in the Discussion section. It seems like an extension of the Results section because there is a comment of the Graphs, The comparison with the relevant literature is very poor

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The paper structure is logical, but the Ethical section is missing. Also, the font and space size is not uniform throughout the paper.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion section is too much and very confusing. There is a need to organize it in a more concise form. The same for the Recommendation section.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references do not much the same style in all the sections of the paper. There is a need for more cited references in particular in the Discussion section.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2

- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

Stephen Inkoom

Once this review has been read, press "Confirm" to indicate that the review process may proceed. If the reviewer has submitted their review elsewhere, you may upload the file below and then press "Confirm" to proceed.

Completed: 2021-12-06 09:15 PM

Recommendation: Accept Submission

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*** The title of the study read "dose variation to critical points in low dose rate intracavitary brachytherapy of cervical cancer as justification for incident learning". This is very clear and relevant to the subject matter.**

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*** Authors gave a background of the study.**

The machine parameters (i.e. manufacturer & country, model, etc.) of the LDR brachytherapy equipment should be stated. Indicate briefly how the AP and LAT images were obtained.

What are some of the incident learning reasons observed from the study?

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Authors should use reported speech to describe methodology, results and discussion. E.g. the use of "was" instead of "is", etc.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*** Yes, the materials utilised and the description of the methodology was clear.**

However, authors should state machine parameters (i.e. manufacturer & country, model, etc.) of the equipment that was used in the study (i.e. Cs-137 LDR brachytherapy system).

Indicate the version of the Prowess Panther treatment planning system (TPS) that was used?

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain any major errors.

However, authors should use reported speech to describe methodology, results and discussion. E.g. the use of "was" instead of "is", etc.

Introduction

Numerous organisations advise on this (Kohn, Corrigan, and Donaldson, 2000).

List some of the organisations?

*

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*** With authors obtaining a percent difference of 2.11 between prescribed and deposited dosage, was impressive, and within standard tolerances. This is indicative of a good practice system at the study centre satisfying the international standard and an intrusion into the Directorate's Incident Learning System.**

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*** Domfeh A. B., Wiredu E. K., Adjei A. A., Ayeh-Kumi P. F. K., Adiku T. K., Tettey Y., Gyasi R. K. and Armah H. B. 2008 Cervical Human Papillomavirus Infection in Accra, Ghana. Ghana Medical Journal Volume 42, Number 2, pp 72 – 78**

WHO, 2008. World cancer report 2008. Geneva: Published by the International Agency for Research on Cancer. World Health Organization (WHO). Available: <http://www.iarc.fr/en/publications/pdfs-online/wrc/2008/index.pdf>. [4/05/2010]

Authors should provide any updated literature on the above two references since 2008?

Organizations like GLOBOCOM have many data on cancer incidence, etc.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):