



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Cancer and Tumor International</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JCTI_33532
Title of the Manuscript:	Photodynamic Therapy For Vulvar Carcinoma In Situ (Case Report)
Type of the Article	Case report

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		
Minor REVISION comments	The manuscript is well-written and very interesting, its limits are: Description of only one case; the lack of comparison between photodynamic therapy and an alternative therapeutic option, short follow-up. These limits should be signalled in the Conclusion Section. On the other hand, it supports scientific research on a very important topic thanks to its documentation and discussion of other Authors' experiences in literature. Material and methods Section: Line 70 "Clinical outcome was evaluated visually and morphologically by cytological or histopathological examination." Line 85-86: The efficacy of the treatment was assessed after 1, 3 and 6 months according to the clinical examination, the vulvoscopy and the results of the cytological examination (Figure 1). Comment: Cytological or histopathological examination should be documented. (Figures, Reports)	Corrected: Antitumor efficacy was evaluated clinically morphologically by cytological examination. Corrected: The efficacy of the treatment was assessed after 3 months according to the clinical examination (Figure 1). According to the cytological examination (January, 15, 2014; № 374-799/2014), which was performed 3 months after PDT, there were no signs of cancer.
Optional/General comments		