

**BPI Review Form 070520**

Book Name:	<a href="#">Medical Research and Its Applications</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_BPR_1589</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Evaluation of Abdominal Aortic Bifurcation Level in Pelvic Cancer Patients Undergoing Radiotherapy: A Retrospective CT Based Analysis</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Book Chapter</b>

**BPI Review Form 070520**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(If agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors must write his/her feedback here)</i>
Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? Please write a few sentences explaining your answer	Yes! The manuscript is important for the scientific community. It can be used as a teaching manual for young doctors training in the radiotherapy department.	
Is the title of the article suitable? Do you have any alternative Title in your mind?	I do ! This title is well adapted to the content of the article.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	Yes!	
Do you think the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	I do ! The English translation is absolutely correct	
Please provide your comments regarding the appropriateness of different sections of the manuscript.	<p>1- Introduction The thorny question of the variation in the upper limit of the pelvic radiation field seems to be well established. The bifurcation of the abdominal aorta into the right and left primitive iliac arteries seems to be an unquestionable anatomical landmark. However, it appears to be too long and can be reduced.</p> <p>2- Patients and methods Well written. However, the analysis method should specify the type of software used to obtain the results.</p> <p>3- Results, Well presented. However, I was left wanting to know the proportion of variation in the bifurcation of the abdominal aorta by primary site.</p> <p>4- Discussion This article discusses the inadequacies of the study. This is why, if possible, the author should introduce a table on the anatomical variation of the bifurcation of the abdominal aorta in relation to the different primary sites in the results section in order to reinforce the discussion.</p> <p>5- Conclusion no comment</p>	
Do you think that the references in the manuscript are proper, recent and sufficient? If you have any suggestions, please write here.	References: 2; 5; 6; 7; 8; 10; 11; 13; 14; 15, 16 need to be updated	

**BPI Review Form 070520**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mamady Keita</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Gamal Abdel Nasser University of Conakry, Guinea</b>