



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIMPS_40236
Title of the Manuscript:	Cytological Features of Fine Needle Aspiration of Breast lesions
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>General Revision Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The title might be slightly misleading; perhaps the title could be revised to mention that the article involves descriptive statistics on fine needle aspiration cases of breast lesions at the Kasr El-Aini Hospital. Perhaps "Descriptive Cytological Statistics of Fine needle Aspiration Cases of Breast Lesions, the Unique Kasr El-Aini Hospital Experience"2. References are out of order (for instance the first reference in the paper on line 20 is reference 10). Consider arranging references in order referenced in paper.3. Some references appear to be unused or uncited in the paper. For instance, I did not see reference 1 referred to in the paper...except in the references section.4. Consider comment regarding relationship between Kasr El-Aini Hospital and Cairo University Hospital. <p>Potential Minor Grammar Revision Comments:</p> <p>There appears to be some possible potential grammatical issues.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Abstract background: consider be "breast lesion cases" instead of "breast lesion^s cases"2. Abstract background: capitalize kasr el-aini hospital (Kasr El-Aini Hospital)3. Abstract Aims: Review instead of Revision4. Abstract Aims: "Fine Needle Aspiration Cytology" does not need capitalization. Could also replace with acronym "FNAC".5. Abstract Place and Duration of Study: Revision should be review, and "Fine Needle Aspiration Cytology" without capitalization or replaced with acronym.6. Abstract "Data required" could be "Data acquired". Also "revised" could be "reviewed".7. Abstract Results: "The age range was from 12 to 86 years, and the mean age of the sample".8. Abstract Conclusion: "different governorates, and to compare between"9. Introduction line 20, 22, and 31: Need space after period in "[10].Recognizing", "[10].Only", and "[14].According".10. Introduction line 32 and 33: excess space between "varies from" and "value from"11. Material and Methods lines 37, 38, and 39: excess space between "needle aspiration", "through collection", and "of medicine".12. Material and Methods line 44: revised should be reviewed.13. Statistical analysis will be conducted line 52: should not be a space between gender and following comma.14. 3.1.3 Mass size range for all cases line 84: "The least mass sizes" sentence is a little confusing. Maybe consider rewording beginning of sentence as "The mass sizes with the smallest number of patients were"15. 3.1.3 Mass size range for all cases line 86: possible rewording..."of the individuals (approximately 76%) have a mass size between 2 cm and 5 cm."16. 3.1.4 Categorization of cases in accord to diagnosis line 99: space needed between graph and 3.17. 3.2.2 Evaluation of clinic-pathological parameters with C2 line 123 and 124: possible rewording "2 cm and 3 cm comprising approximately 21% of the cases." Approximately should be before the stated %. Also, after "From the graph" there should be a comma.18. 3.2.2 Evaluation of clinic-pathological parameters with C2 line 125: rewording "skewed; there were a few cases with higher values of mass size. On the other hand, there were many cases with..."19.3.2.3 Evaluation of clinic-pathological parameters with C3 line 133: rewording "The age distribution was skewed to the right; there were many young individuals."20. 3.2.3 Evaluation of clinic-pathological parameters with C3 line 139: "All of the 31 cases"	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>are female (100%).”</p> <p>21. 3.2.4 Evaluation of clinico-pathological parameters with C4 line 144: category should be categories, and no period should be present after “(33.3%)”.</p> <p>22. 3.2.4 Evaluation of clinic-pathological parameters with C4 line 146: “The age distribution was skewed to the left; there were many older individuals.”</p> <p>23. 3.3.3 Correlation between mass size & diagnosis line 201 and 202: “most of the individuals (approximately 76%) had a mass size between 2 cm and 5 cm.” Space between 5 and cm.</p> <p>24. 3.3.3 Correlation between mass size & diagnosis line 204: “3.5 cm. Our...” Space after period, and beginning O in our of new sentence should be capitalized.</p> <p>25. 3.3.3 Correlation between mass size & diagnosis line 205: “1 cm to 12 cm (the mean of” should start parenthesis before the.</p> <p>26. 3.3.3 Correlation between mass size & diagnosis line 206-207: “primary the tumour” the should not be capitalized and “1.5 cm to 11 cm with an average of 4.1 cm” replace the mean with an.</p> <p>27. 3.3.3 Correlation between mass size & diagnosis line 208: should be space after ,</p> <p>28. 3.3.3 Correlation between mass size & diagnosis line 213: “In C5 diagnosis cases” in should be capitalized.</p> <p>29. 3.3.3 Correlation between mass size & diagnosis line 214: reword as “Our findings are nearly in agreement with [3].”</p> <p>30. 3.3.3 Correlation between mass size & diagnosis line 216: excess space between “the highest”</p> <p>31. 3.3.3 Correlation between mass size & diagnosis line 218: “80% of all diagnoses were in those over 50”</p> <p>32. 3.3.3 Correlation between mass size & diagnosis line 219: “2008 and 2010)”</p> <p>33 3.3.3 Correlation between mass size & diagnosis line 225: no period after [17] and “in benign conditions (C2)”.</p> <p>34. 3.3.3 Correlation between mass size & diagnosis line 226: “with mean of 34.8. Our”</p> <p>35. 3.3.3 Correlation between mass size & diagnosis line 230: thate should be that</p> <p>36. 3.3.3 Correlation between mass size & diagnosis line 233: comma after [14]</p> <p>37. 3.3.3 Correlation between mass size & diagnosis line 235: space between 86 and years</p> <p>38. 3.3.3 Correlation between mass size & diagnosis line 237-238: space between a and slightly, recored should be recorded, and comma after [33].</p> <p>39. Conclusion line 253: no space should be before commas.</p> <p>40. Conclusion line 258-259: instead of semicolons, consider putting parenthesis around diagnosis categories C1, C2, C3, C4 and C5.</p> <p>41. Conclusion line 261: “breast masses, a triple test”</p> <p>42. Conclusion line 263: “governorates, and to compare”</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jeffrey Petersen
Department, University & Country	University of Pennsylvania, USA