



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Cancer and Tumor International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JCTI_29776
Title of the Manuscript:	RADIO-INDUCED SARCOMAS
Type of the Article	Case study

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	This paper presented a case about orbital sarcoma induced by radiation. Excellent case was selected. Radiation induced sarcoma is a hot topic with a lot of studies to talk about. With more extensive literature reading, detailed case presentation and inspiring discussions, This paper can be an excellent paper for readers. There are several papers were published previously related to radiation induced sarcoma/secondary malignancy. The authors could potentially learn from them to see how to improve this paper. 1. Overall, the paper is lack of in-depth literature review and discussion. Authors should include more material to enrich this paper. The paper was written in poor English. It has incomplete sentences, inappropriate punctuations and prepositions. Many sentences are confusing. Strongly recommend reviewing it with a person with good English written skills before submission. This paper needs serious editing. (just a few examples: Line 19 "the most serious radiation induced sarcoma" doesn't have a verb; Line 38 "the assessment of extension is normal" is confusing; Line 39 "The limits of resection were healthy" doesn't make sense; Line 46 "swelling cheek left" should be left swelling cheek; Line 61 "the treaties patient" perhaps should be the treated patients; Line 72-73 some errors? ...)	1. The article was improved; the remarks were taken into account The article was improved; the remarks were taken into account
Minor REVISION comments	Almost all of references were published before 2000. Needs to cite more recent papers to enrich this paper.	Recent references have been added
Optional/General comments	It is better if the author could add the patient's treatment plan as a picture.	I do not have patient's treatment plan as a picture, the article was drafted during my training in Morocco; I am no longer on Moroccan soil since the end of 2013