

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-53617

Date: 31-08-2025

Title: STEREOTACTIC IRRADIATION: EVALUATION OF EFFICACY IN THE RADIOTHERAPY DEPARTMENT

Recommendation:

Accept as it is
 Accept after minor revision.....✓.....
 Accept after major revision
 Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance	✓			

Reviewer Name: Mr. Shashi Prakash

Date: 31-08-2025

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

(To be published with the manuscript in the journal)

The reviewer is requested to provide a brief comment (3-4 lines) highlighting the significance, strengths, or key insights of the manuscript. This comment will be Displayed in the journal publication alongside with the reviewers name.

It is the inaugural institutional experience assessing stereotactic radiotherapy (STRT) outcomes in Morocco and illustrating high local control (83.7%) and an outstanding safety profile in agreement with the international standard. The manuscript is well written and clinically relevant, illustrating the possibility of high-precision radiotherapy within a middle-income environment. Refinements and methodological clarification on minor aspects will add clarity and strength.

Detailed Reviewer's Report

The abstract effectively captures the objectives of study, methodology, and major findings, but it needs to briefly state the retrospective nature of the study and limitation of follow-up for the sake of transparency. Further, define "response rate" as radiologic or clinical to prevent confusion.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

The introduction properly situates the significance of STRT but would be enhanced with an express mention of the knowledge gap in Morocco at the outset and minimal references. Include 1–2 sentences describing the unique contribution this study makes to the literature (e.g., first application, resource-constrained setting).

This section is exhaustively described and detailed; however, a couple of clarifications must be made. State whether the study was prospective or retrospective (text mentions "longitudinal cross-sectional," which is not clear). Define inclusion/exclusion criteria precisely and state how "efficacy" and "local control" were measured. A word about ethics approval or consent is also required.

Results are well-organized and supported by tables and figures, but some quantitative statements should include confidence intervals or percentages rounded consistently. Simplify overly detailed narrative descriptions of rooms/equipment to maintain scientific focus.

The discussion places findings within international literature and highlights safety and efficacy very well. It would be improved by a more explicit explanation of the reason why local control was marginally lower than some quoted studies (e.g., lesion type or variation in dose). The limitations paragraph is excellent, but retrospective nature and loss to follow-up would be more strongly highlighted. Try reducing repetition of results in the discussion.

The conclusion is nicely done in pointing out institutional success and the way forward. It can be condensed by emphasizing implications and future steps (prospective, multicenter trials, long-term follow-up) instead of reproducing salient findings.