



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Cancer and Tumor International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JCTI_46642
Title of the Manuscript:	Patterns of care in Retinoblastoma and analysis of contributory factors – lessons learned from 5 years' experience in a tertiary care center in Eastern India
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Place of study is declared in the abstract and text Retrospective study- what happened to the patients as of now Radiologically proven retinoblastoma-details to be mentioned Globocan and ICMR to be explained once. Record based study- if all the clinical observations were made by a single observer? Observer bias needs to be considered. Details to be provided for staging, presence of poor prognostic risk factors, survival time and family history. Treatment details of how many sessions, to be mentioned. Survivor data to be furnished. The median age of onset was 22 months. How was blurring of vision a presenting symptom? How was visual acuity recorded? How was the diagnosis made-histologically and radiologically, method to be described. Why there was a delay of 5 months in diagnosing? Discussion is incomplete. Observations to be discussed with other studies 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Place of study removed from abstract in revised manuscript. Information furnished in revised manuscript. Details furnished in revised manuscript. Explained in the Introduction of revised manuscript. Accepted under limitations section of the revised manuscript. Furnished in revised manuscript. Furnished in revised manuscript. Furnished in revised manuscript. Addressed in revised manuscript under "Presenting symptoms" section. Details furnished in revised manuscript. Furnished in revised manuscript. Addressed in revised manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments	References to be written in Vancouver style.	Done in revised manuscript.
Optional/General comments	Need to develop the skill of writing a manuscript.	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	There are no ethical issues as the study was retrospective and identities and profile of patients have been kept confidential.