



REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-56302

Title: Radiotherapy in Adult Medulloblastoma with Synchronous Drop Metastasis: A Case Report

- Recommendation:**
- Accept as it is
 - ✓ Accept after minor revision.....
 - Accept after major revision
 - Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance	✓			

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

Date: 21.02.26

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strengths of the Study

- **Originality and Relevance:** The manuscript addresses a rare clinical presentation of adult medulloblastoma with synchronous spinal metastasis, contributing valuable insights to a limited existing literature base.
- **Clinical Detailing:** Provides a comprehensive account of the diagnostic process, including imaging and histopathological confirmation, which enhances clinical understanding.
- **Treatment Strategy:** Demonstrates the application of conformal craniospinal irradiation combined with focal spinal boosting, exemplifying current advanced radiotherapy techniques.
- **Outcome Documentation:** The patient's follow-up demonstrating sustained remission for 17 months adds meaningful clinical data on treatment efficacy.
- **Structured Approach:** The case is presented in a clear, logical sequence, facilitating reader comprehension.

Weaknesses of the Study

- **Limited Generalizability:** As a single case report, findings cannot be generalized; this limits the strength of the conclusions regarding treatment efficacy.
- **Lack of Molecular Data:** Molecular subgrouping, which can influence prognosis and treatment response, was not performed due to unavailability, missing an important aspect of current personalized therapy.
- **Absence of Long-term Follow-up Data:** While 17 months follow-up is reported, longer-term outcomes are necessary to assess durability of remission.
- **Insufficient Details on Chemotherapy:** The chemotherapy administered is briefly described, but details on rationale, dosing, and response are limited.
- **Statistical Analysis:** No statistical analysis or comparison with other cases or outcomes, which is acceptable for a case report but limits interpretability.
- **Figures and Tables:** The figures are descriptive but could benefit from more detailed annotations and high-resolution images for clarity.

Reviewer Comments

- **Title and Abstract:** The title accurately reflects the case focus. The abstract is concise but could be improved with clearer separation of key findings and more explicit statement of significance.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- **Introduction and Objectives:** The introduction covers relevant background but might benefit from emphasizing the novelty of adult cases with synchronous spinal metastasis and clearly stating the specific objectives of this report.
- **Methodology and Analysis:** The radiotherapy planning details are thorough. However, the description of chemotherapy decision-making and follow-up protocols could be expanded to enhance reproducibility.
- **Results and Discussion:** The results are well presented. The discussion appropriately contextualizes findings within existing literature but should include a more critical appraisal of limitations and potential biases.
- **Conclusion and Implications:** The conclusion summarizes key points and reinforces the importance of systematic staging and multimodal therapy. It would be strengthened by explicit consideration of long-term management and follow-up strategies.
- **Ethical Clearance and Consent:** Ethical approval is not explicitly mentioned, but it is noted that informed consent was obtained. Clarify whether institutional review board or ethics committee approval was secured if applicable.
- **Language and Presentation:** Overall, language is clear, but minor grammatical adjustments and proofreading are recommended. For example, consistency in referencing and formatting of citations should be ensured.
- **Figures and References:** Figures are appropriate but could be improved with more detailed labels. The references are relevant but should follow exact journal citation formats uniformly.

Note: Based on the content, there is no indication that it has been previously published on the internet or in other academic sources. However, to definitively confirm originality and prevent potential plagiarism issues, I recommend running the manuscript through a dedicated plagiarism detection tool or cross-referencing with established medical databases.