Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Asian Oncology Research Journal**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AORJ_126280**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Radiotherapy in synovial sarcoma of the larynx: An organ preservation approach**
Type of the Article	**Case report**

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/
Benefits for Reviewers: https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
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.	This manuscript provides insight into the rare occurrence of synovial sarcoma in the larynx, a case scarcely documented in the literature. By detailing the diagnostic challenges, treatment decisions, and outcomes, the study could offer guidance to clinicians facing similar cases and underscores the importance of timely diagnosis for organ preservation. The report is well-structured, with a clear presentation of the therapeutic approach. Overall, this manuscript is a beneficial addition to the field, addressing an unusual malignancy with practical implications for both diagnosis and patient management. My comments try to improve the clarity and add particular useful for the readers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	TITLE: Specify the design of the study by adding "Case Report" to the title.	
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.	ABSTRACT: The abstract's aim section is incomplete; clarify the purpose of the case report by stating what you aim to illustrate or demonstrate through this case (no what you are presenting). KEYWORDS: Prefer MeSH keywords for better indexing.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	INTRODUCTION: 1. Provide some background on radiotherapy for this anatomical region, addressing both its advantages and limitations. 2. As with the abstract, add a clear statement about the study's aim at the end of the introduction. METHODS: Include additional patient details, such as race, and relevant lifestyle habits (e.g., smoking status). FIGURE: Consider including an image of the tumor or a diagram/painting of its location for clarity (preferably a real image if available). RESULTS: Highlight the timeframe to diagnosis, especially if delayed. Comment on whether this delay was due to rapid tumour progression or other factors (delayed in diagnosis, patient's choice), and include your follow-up strategy (frequency, duration) with	

	reference to guidelines if applicable. CONCLUSION: Clarify what this study adds to existing literature on sarcoma of the larynx. The conclusions should explicitly answer to the study's aim, emphasizing the significance of your findings. These improvements can strengthen the report's clarity and impact, enhancing its value to the literature on laryngeal sarcoma treatment.	
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.	DISCUSSION: 1. Start with a summary of your results for context. 2. Address recurrence, noting that it can occur due to new tumour growth or tumor regrowth over time (synchronous or metachronous tumor), reinforcing the need for a comprehensive follow-up plan.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. **-**	DISCUSSION: When discussing organ preservation, emphasize the importance of early diagnosis and the necessity of regular follow-ups to monitor for recurrence. Also, note the role of follow up also for managing associated comorbidities that can influence the outcomes, i.e. gastroesophageal reflux to support healing and improve post-laryngectomy fistula function, which is critical for speech in cases involving total laryngectomy (referencing DOI: 10.1007/s00405-012-1938-2 and DOI: 10.1016/j.jvoice.2013.08.008).	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	MAIN TEXT: Use more formal language, avoiding terms like "we" or "our."	
Optional/General comments		

Editorial Comments (This section is reserved for the comments from journal editorial office and editors):

	Author's Feedback
You are hereby suggested to include following recent references to improve the quality of the manuscript. Verma, R., Verma, R. R., Verma, R. R., & Sardana, N. K. (2014). Synovial sarcoma: laryngopharynx a challenge. *Indian Journal of Otolaryngology and Head & Neck Surgery*, *66*(2), 219-223. Madabhavi, I., Bhardawa, V., Modi, M., Patel, A., & Sarkar, M. (2018). Primary synovial sarcoma (SS) of larynx: An unusual site. *Oral Oncology*, *79*, 80-82.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Rita Chiaramonte**
Department, University & Country	**University of Catania, Italy**