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Reviewer's report:

Article: Intraoperative radiotherapy electron boost in advanced and recurrent epithelial ovarian carcinoma: a retrospective study

The combination of IOERT with IP Chemotherapy is interesting, I would suggest not to include the patients who did not receive chemotherapy and maybe even exclude those who only received iv chemotherapy, as it is hard to imagine that the dose of IOERT only without additional treatment has a real impact.

Major compulsory revisions:

1) The general concept of IOERT in this patient group should be stated more clearly. Why is IOERT not combined with EBRT? Why is it called „boost“? As long as no EBRT is planned it should better be called high single dose.

2) The method of IOERT should be explained in more detail. Were patients treated during surgery with a dedicated linear accelerator? What was the target area and who defined it. How big were the IOERT fields and what energies for the electrons were chosen?

3) The data are not always clear or consistent. E.g. in the patient characteristic part local and distant relapse of 16 patients is described. In the result part it is stated that 17/45 patients died of disease.

4) As the patient collective is small, if the patients with IOERT and IP chemotherapy are included only, a table showing all patients (gender, age, stage, location and size of IOERT field, MeV chosen, DFS, OS, location of failure) could be of interest.Local control should not be included in the patient characteristics but is worth ist own heading

5) The discussion is often confusing as general statements concerning IOERT are made, that do not apply his study as no EBRT was performed (e.g. second and third paragraph discussion - why should IOERT improve extremity preservation in this study???)

6) The report is badly written and hard to understand due to major language problem
Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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