



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	2014_JAMPS_15296
Title of the Manuscript:	Interobserver agreement for Pap smear and visual inspection tests in southern Brazil
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	The abbreviation must be described before it's use e.g., ASC-US , VIAM, VIIM, ALTS study etc. Motivation of the study in introduction is not enough. The first sentence needs reconstruction for example; "most of the world countries can be changed to most of the countries, 25-64 years old women can be changed to women between 25 and 64 years old. The second paragraph in introduction section may be omitted. The purpose of the study should be explained after the clear statement of the objectives of the study. Study method How many patients/study subjects did not sign consent? How did the exclusion criteria were determine? The Bethesda system of classification needs further detailed explanation for understanding of the readers. For pap smear, the inter observer differences between a laboratory technician, a pathologist specialized in cytopathology and the third observer being a pathologist specialized in cytopathology are not comparable professionally. Thus the comparison between the second and the third observers would have been better.	Corrected. Changed as suggested. The paragraph was removed and more details were added to clarify the aims of the study in the 3rd paragraph. In the first paragraph of the cited section, there is a description of the consent signed by all study participants. Inclusion/exclusion criteria are now highlighted under subheadings (lines 72-80) as suggested by another referee. The Bethesda System has been detailed in the new version of the text (lines 87-95). That was precisely the point we are trying to make. The shortage of pathologists specialized in cytopathology and their substitution by a laboratory technician is a widespread practice in many countries with limited resources, including Brazil.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	It is not clear when VIT was employed to the subjects. Was it on the same day when pap smear was undertaken or on another day? What is VILI diagnosis? There is a need for full explanation of IARC classification. The presentation of results is not clear. The mean age, age of menarche should be different as the numbers of subjects (samples) are different for two tests. The total numbers in table 1 is incorrect. Table 2, Obsevador 2 should be corrected. Discussion Better arguments are needed for the differences of different Pap test results among the observers and obtaining high Kappa value in the study. Similarly, better arguments are require to justify the high Kappa value for VIT in this study. Conclusions The last sentence is not supported by the findings of the study this merely the assuming statement of the authors.	The VIT was employed immediately after collection of Pap specimen as we now explain on lines 115-116. We also added the meaning of VILI (visual inspection with Lugol's iodineI) on line 47 e some more details on line 118. IARC classification for VIT has now been amplified (lines 125-141) and a reference [11] was added. We corrected the tables (sorry) and added the information of mean age of the participants, their age of menarche and of the first sexual intercourse for both Pap and VIT (lines 156-162). We argue that main components of the cited differences are the lack of quality control for laboratory procedures and insufficient training of the health professionals who participate in cervical cancer screening, both of which may significantly reduce the errors. High levels of agreement in this study have been attributed precisely to the intensive training of these professionals throughout discussion. The last sentence was modified (lines 306-309).
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Language issues. Ethical issues: What was explained to the participants before signing or not signing the consent for the study? What measures were taken to improve the acceptance level?	A language revision was made. The study participants were informed that various tests for cervical cancer and pre-cancer lesions were offered, including Pap and VIT. The VIT procedures were explained in detail, including the application of acetic acid and lugol's iodine, as well as posterior use of magnification glasses. The importance of regular screening for cervical cancer, the efficacy of the tests and the need to improve interobserver agreement to arrive at more precise diagnosis were stressed in order to motivate the women to participate in the study. However, these are mainly the information provided for any screening session, so no special measures were taken to improve the uptake. In addition, the assurance of removing all personal data and maintaining the data in confidence was informed. All testing procedures are approved by the Brazilian Ministry of Health and routinely performed during check-up. No risk to the patient health could be envisaged. The study participants were also informed that it was entirely up to them to decide whether to participate in the study, without affecting their medical exams and treatment whatsoever. Those who signed the consent form were told that they might withdraw their participation if they change their minds. As the research ethics committee approved the study, the authors did not wish to burden the text with all these details.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		