



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	ABSTRACT: Please have an introductory statement to give a background for the study. Please write out the full meaning of ASC-US in first use. A prospective cross-sectional study design for this work is very unlikely! Author may wish to review the study design utilized or written here. INTRODUCTION: Please write abbreviations in full at time of first use. METHODOLOGY 1. Please give adequate description of study area with emphasis on relevant characteristics that may add validity to this study 2. Author(s) evaluated the reported results of the Pap smear test / VIA test and this should be reflected in the methodology. The first sentence appears misleading in this context. 3. Was there any sampling methodology employed or was this purposive? How were the 380 pap smear specimen test results/ 284 VIA Test results selected? 4. The level of expertise of the Nurses,	Done (lines 8-13) It was indeed a prospective study to accrue a sufficient number of patients, but the data analysis was not based on repeated measures, i.e. it was cross-sectional. We removed "prospective" to avoid confusion. Done. The methods section has been re-organized under new subheadings as suggested by another reviewer. More details have been provided. No sampling was used to select the Pap and VIT results reported. However, only women with complete VIT were included (lines 66,78-80). Done.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Laboratory technician and pathologist (or indeed any other individuals involved in result interpretation) can best be exhibited by their qualifications followed by their work experience. 5. Line 114 – 116: Cases considered difficult to classify were investigated further. How? How did this affect this study? What were the limitations to this study? RESULT Quite impressive DISCUSSION 1. There is need for appropriate referencing and referencing style should be consistent with the Vancouver Style already employed. There is no need for an overlap in style. E.g. Line 159: "as reported in another Brazilian Study (11)". Please correct for all. 2. Line 158: What is meant by "good accuracy"? 3. What are the special characteristics of each observer in the different comparative studies? The competence of each observer on diagnostic accuracy may be determined to a large extent by their level of qualification and training. ETHICAL APPROVAL Please transfer this section to the methodology	It was meant to say "Cases considered difficult to classify on VIT" and has been corrected on line 145. We double-checked the reference style employed by the journal but could not see what would be wrong. Above 80% is usually considered good. We added some more information on this but did not wish to burden the text with too many details. Done (lines 151-153).
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		