



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIMPS_38117
Title of the Manuscript:	Routine histopathological analysis of non-suspicious looking foreskin for adult patients: is it necessary?
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>)

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	All the samples are from a single center. Authors should justify why they didn't consider taking samples from other centers only. Non suspicious looking foreskins should not be sent for analysis. This outcome is a very general consideration which needs to be decided by the Doctor at the time of examination. What if Dr feels necessary to examine even if it is not a suspicious looking case. There are many factors and this solely depends on the Dr to take a decision whether to go for histology or not. I need the authors to justify the purpose of this study.	We agree this study is limited by the single centre nature. We have clearly stated this in the limitations section of the discussion. This hospital take referral for circumcision from other area because other hospitals perform more complex surgery like robotic surgery. We have suggested that individual risk factors should be considered even if foreskin looks normal in the discussion. We have included a box in the text to highlight the risk factors which might prompt clinical suspicion. We clearly justify the study by providing a common sense approach, cost analysis, and quality control element indicated by intra-study specificity calculation of clinical and histological BXO (Balanitis xerotica obliterans) .
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		