

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

Dr. Tarun Kumar Das

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Comments to the Authors

The authors have submitted the paper entitled "Analysis of Dosimetric Parameters of Linear Accelerator." The paper is not written properly and is not organized well. Although attractive results have been obtained in the experiment and it has major technical aspects, some corrections are required for the improvement of the quality of the paper. The authors are requested to follow the guidelines as follows and resubmit the paper for further revision. The overall decision is **MAJOR REVISION**.

The suggestions are:

1. The abstract is poor. It is suggested to rewrite.
2. The Introduction section is not well documented. As a general rule of a good quality research paper, the literature survey is generally included in the Introduction section with the advancements achieved in chronological order (year wise, not mandatory always). Also, the limitations of already proposed works are also to be highlighted. Finally, in a separate paragraph, the proposed work is discussed briefly, especially highlighting what novelties and advancements were achieved in the proposed work compared to other published work. The authors have included only 6 references in the Introduction section, which are not recent papers (before 2018). It is strongly suggested to include more recent papers (after 2018), highlighting their contributions. It is also suggested to make a separate paragraph at the end of the Introduction section highlighting only the contributions of the proposed work.
3. As a standard rule of units, there must be a space between the value and the unit. It is not followed in some places of the paper. Some of the examples are 6Mev, 9Mev, 12Mev, 15Mev, 18Mev, and 22Mev, 0.5cm, 20cm, etc. It is suggested to correct all.
4. Replace 0.1cm³ by 0.1 cm³.
5. All the figures are blurred, not visible properly. They will be more degraded when prints are taken. It is suggested to replace all figures with high-resolution images with clear text.
6. Give the figure number and caption for each figure below all the figures.
7. Mention (i) beside equation 1, (ii) beside equation 2, and so on in the same line at the end.
8. The variables mentioned in the equations are not mentioned below the equations in the text. Mention those.
9. Give a step number or bullet for each step in 2.2. Dosimetric and Plan Evaluation.
10. Justify all paragraphs.

11. Explain the results and discussion section with more details. It is too short. Specially mention at last what attractive results were obtained.
12. Add a comparative table at the end of the results section with all relevant parameters of the proposed model with some of the works mentioned in the reference list. Mention what novelty has been obtained in the proposed work in connection with the comparative table.
13. Rewrite the conclusion section again by including the facts: (1) objectives of the work, (2) specifications of the proposed model, (3) what methodology was followed and how it was executed, (4) what results were obtained, (5) what novelty was achieved, and finally (6) application areas.
14. Please follow strictly the reference list as per the journal's template.