



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Cancer and Tumor International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JCTI_44996
Title of the Manuscript:	THE THERAPEUTIC IMPACT OF LYMPHADENECTOMY IN THE MANAGEMENT OF EPITHELIAL OVARIAN CANCER: A SINGLE INSTITUTION EXPERIENCE
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>)

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript is a retrospective observational study to assess the impact of lymphadenectomy on overall survival (OS) and progression free survival (PFS) in patients with epithelial ovarian cancer. There were 83 cases, divided into 2 groups, based on the number of lymph nodes harvested, more (Group 1) or less (Group 2) than 30 lymph nodes. The median OS was 55.7 months in Group 1 vs 49.0 months in Group 2. The median PFS was 49.0 months in Group 1 and 43.46 months in Group 2. However, these differences were not statistically significant. They found that performance status, node positivity and residual disease were the significant predictors of mortality.</p> <p>I have a few questions and comments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is there an ethical committee to approve this study, such as Institutional Review Board?</li> <li>2. Tables were inserted in the result with formatting errors, and were difficult to read. Typically, tables are at the end of manuscript on a separate page.</li> <li>3. Each figure should have a legend below the figure.</li> <li>4. Figure 2 looked like PFS days were less in the Group 1 than the Group 2, or was the figure in poor quality and the horizontal line did not show up?</li> <li>5. The authors said they were not statistically differences in OS and PFS between groups, but the manuscript did not show the p value. According to your data, systematic lymphadenectomy, which harvested more than 30 lymph nodes in the Group 1 had 5 months longer OS and PFS than the Group 2. From your Kaplan-Meier survival curve, two groups had a clear separation after 500 days, and the separation continued after 1500 days. Lack of statistical significance in the study for OS and PFS may be due to the small sample size. In many clinical trials of ovarian cancer treatment, 5 months longer in OS or PFS were statistically significant. From patient's prospect, 5 months can be significant for them to see children's graduation or wedding, to see a grandchild birth. In your conclusion, "Systematic lymphadenectomy does not have a significant impact on improving overall survival or progression free survival in epithelial ovarian cancers". You may consider that systematic lymphadenectomy had a trend of improving overall and progression free survival in epithelial ovarian cancers. Further investigation is warranted.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<i>Yi Pan</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Saint Louis University, USA</i>