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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript covered an important issue about the decision making for the treatment of the elderly patients with brain metastasis. The authors analyzed the prognostic factors of these patients treated with Gamma Knife radiosurgery (GKRS) and evaluated which scoring system would be the most suitable for the prediction of prognosis and helpful for treatment decision. This manuscript is well analyzed and well written. However, it needs some minor revisions.

<Minor Essential Revisions>

1. There have been already many papers about the prognostic factors for the patients with brain metastases after radiosurgery. As authors pointed out, the purpose and merit of this study is to determine most appropriate scoring system. Therefore, authors should decrease the simple analysis for prognostic factors and focus on evaluation of scoring system.

2. This manuscript is too long, especially result section. The authors made very detailed and lengthy tables, and so should not repeat same description in the context. Based on Table 2, 3, and 4, the "Patients' characteristics" and Overall survival and prognostic factors" paragraphs should be shortened and summarized, and only important points could be emphasized.

3. The Table 5 is not necessary and should be deleted. The brief mention about the negative results in the context is enough. The role of chemotherapy is not the main topic of this manuscript. The sentence about chemotherapy in results of abstract should be deleted. And, the final sentence of discussion about the suggestion of concurrent use of chemotherapy and GKRS should be also deleted. That sentence is so random.

4. A few minor errors about spelling and the location of reference number in context (for example, Kim et al. [29] found~). The reference number 5 should be checked again. The final sentence of methods of abstract should be revised.

Thank you.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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