

[Review Form 2](#)

Book Name:	Science and Technology: Recent Updates and Future Prospects
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2420
Title of the Manuscript:	RADIATION PROTECTION OF PATIENT DURING STEREOTACTIC RADIOSURGERY. Part I: Single isocenter phantom measurements
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The discussion of radiation protection and the estimation of peripheral dose (PD) during radiotherapy is one of the most important and interesting discussions among researchers. The results of these studies can provide useful information to improve the treatment methods and reduce damage to healthy tissues around the desired target.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of this manuscript is suitable.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of this manuscript includes four parts of introduction, methods and materials, results and conclusion, but it needs a serious revision.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	This manuscript includes five sections of abstract, introduction, methods and materials, results and discussion, and conclusion. There are no subsections in this manuscript. As mentioned in the part of comments, the explanations related to different sections are insufficient and it is necessary to provide more detailed explanations to improve the quality of the manuscript.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The explanations related to the results of this manuscript are very brief and insufficient. In order to comment on the scientific correctness of this manuscript, It is necessary for the authors to provide more details about the results of their study by including images of the used experimental setup and tables of the obtained data values in the manuscript.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references used in this manuscript are not recent. 21 references are used in this manuscript that most of them are old (16 references for years before 2000, 4 references for years 2000-2005 and a reference under publication) . It is better to use more recent references.	

[Review Form 2](#)

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No, the English quality of this manuscript is not suitable, and it needs to a serious major revision.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>❖ All comments are included in the text of the manuscript. Please see the manuscript file. The summary of the comments as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Although the topic discussed and the results obtained in this study are interesting and important, this manuscript contains many typographical errors and has a poor English expersion, so that it needs a serious major revision for language and grammar. ➤ In the "Introduction" section, there is no explanation about the purpose of the study. It is better that the aim of the study be briefly explained in 2 or 3 sentences. Moreover, it would be useful to provide more detailed explanations about the different factors that contribute to the peripheral dose, such as different radiation components (leakage radiation and scattered radiations), and factors related to the Gamma Knife machine (collimator size, number of shots, arrengment of arcs). ➤ In the "Methods and Materials" section, it would be helpful to include a image of the gamma knife machine and phantom used in the manuscript. Also, specifying the different components of the Gamma Knife machine, mentioned in this manuscript, can be instructive. ➤ In the "results and discussion" section, the explanations related to the findings of the study are very brief and insufficient. For example, there is no explanation about the results of peripheral dose obtained for the different organs investigated in this manuscript. It is necessary to provide more detailed information about the results of this study by including images of used experimental setup and tables of obtained data values. In order to improve the quality of the manuscript, it is suggested to separate the "results" and "discussion" sections, and the authors discuss the results in detail in the "Discussion" section. ➤ In the "conclusion" section, there are long and incomprehensible sentences that need to be revised. 	

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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)</u>
<p><u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u></p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Mahsa Noori-Asl</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of Mohaghegh Ardabili, Iran</p>