



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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Title: The title is not attractive and better to change it. Abstract: The abstract part should not be structured and should contain the keywords used in searching the literatures. The period should be added in both text and abstract. (e.x from 2008 -2015), to let readers know that you have searched in what period (Rewrite it). Key words: should be the same one used in searching. (e.x the keywords used in the methods is different from the key words written after abstract. Methods: you should mention the details articles and books you got from searching as well as the strategy you have used in writing this review. Results: you cannot just put the collected information as it is without any conclusion from the literature that you have searched. Please write only results not results/literature. The table presented in results part is not good at all. You should design another table or/s to summarize all the information which you have collected from the literatures. References: please list the first six authors followed by et al. and standardize all the references.	The title has been changed but sincerely it does not matter in my opinion. It has been a standard way of writing a title. The abstract is in a non-structured format now. The period in my opinion does not matter because these days when you do a google or PubMed / other searches with your search words it gives you information as far back as it can. Results, has been used and literature review removed. The number of key words has been reduced. I have not changed the format of the table. I would rely on you to offer a new design that would correspond with your journal format and include all the information References have been changed to conform to your journal format.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There many grammatical errors need to be corrected, please do editing. In references part there is no space after the volume number, so please standardize all references. Create 2 or 3 tables to present the whole information which you have collected it from the literature to enable people enjoy reading your manuscript.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		