



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Cancer and Tumor International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JCTI_21431
Title of the Manuscript:	Primary Angiosarcoma of the Prostate Gland: A Review of the Literature
Type of the 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: Under method, mention the (or some of the) internet data bases used, provide the search/key words used and date range covered. The conclusion needs to be recast to capture the central theme of the review. As written, dwelt on recommendation. In particular, the sentence "Perhaps if patients who develop relapse disease who had previously undergone radiotherapy for prostate cancer undergo further biopsies of prostate may be new cases of PASOP would be diagnosed in the new biopsy specimens." is redundant and did not convey any meaning suggestive of a valid conclusion. Key words: need to be within the maximum for the journal Introduction: Unless in accordance with the journal's style, not well referenced. Line 38 to 56 not referenced at all. Good references and referencing are the hallmarks of good review articles. Methods Line 86 to 102, instead of stating individual definitions, give a cut across definition for the various definitions and cite the authors. That makes a better and readable review. Generally the method adopted here is unnecessary	Abstract The search data bases have been included A non- structured format has been used and there is no section in abstract as conclusion Introduction In my opinion a general introduction does not need referencing considering the fact that the general statements made have been addressed in the main paper but I have included 3 references relating to radiotherapy associated PASOP. There is no need to include non-radiotherapy associated references in general open statements I prefer to leave it as it is. That is my style. If it is not acceptable to your journal I would make the submission elsewhere. I



SDI Review Form 1.6

	lengthy, perhaps because the collated materials were largely not processed but used raw. Essentially, the author(s) need to process the information generated and represent the central idea in an easy to follow thought flow.	prefer a lengthy document
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		