

# Review of: "Analysis of Dosimetric Parameters of Linear Accelerator"

Sara Principi

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

I would like to thank the authors for the effort in putting this article together. However, I noticed several deficiencies.

The title is too generic.

The abstract needs major revision. For example, the 2nd sentence is not specific, needs to be clearer. Re. 3rd sentence about objectives, please check English. Please clarify what MU is (Monitor Units). The last sentence of the abstract is very difficult to read.

Chapter 2

2.1

Multi-Leaf Collimator should appear the first time the acronym MLC is mentioned.

Cm<sup>3</sup>, please use the correct format for cm to the power of 3.

Figures are not numbered.

Part 2.2

What is the central axis dose normalization factor exactly, and how is this factor chosen?"

"Determine the percentage of variation in daily dose output compared to the reference." Please improve English and clarity. Again, check English throughout all this part, i.e., "...to release tolerance to use." What does it mean?

To reduce uncertainty, do you reduce tolerance? In what sense?

"Calculate beam flatness using equation (ii) using five chambers at 80% of the dimension relative to the profile." This sentence does not make much sense in such a form.

Again, what is or what value is associated with the flatness factor, and how is this value chosen?

Part 3

Check English. Improve figures, references, and captions. The results section needs to be greatly improved; there is no explanation of the results, just figures which are not referenced in the main manuscript, and please be consistent with x-axis labels, i.e., number of days v.s. days, and label the y-axis.

There is no discussion, which is a major part of an article.

The conclusions make a statement on uncertainties; where is this coming from?

My opinion is that this article is very difficult to read and lacks clarity, precision, and rigor. For this reason, I appreciate the work, but it needs a really substantial revision before thinking about submitting it to a peer-reviewed journal, and I would suggest the authors to empathize with the reader when rewriting and reviewing the manuscript. Thanks.

