



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Cancer and Tumor International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JCTI_43949
Title of the Manuscript:	Histopathologic Patterns of Urological Malignancies in Calabar, South-southern Nigeria: A Ten-Year Review
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 BACKGROUND: This should have contained information on the subject matter that is urological malignancies not limiting the background to outcome of their results. There should be gaps in knowledge identified or justification for carrying out the study. METHODOLOGY: There is no need of separating study design and place of study from the methodology. Kindly merged your study design and place of study under methodology. CONCLUSION: This should capture the summary of your novel findings in the study and if possible suggest way(s) of preventing the scourge of urological malignancies in the locality. KEYWORDS: Keywords should not be too many, at least 3 or 4 keywords are ok. Example: Histological patterns, urological malignancies, Calabar. BODY OF THE ARTICLE INTRODUCTION: The introduction is too scanty as far as this scientific study is concern. The introduction should highlight results of epidemiological studies conducted worldwide and within Nigeria on the subject matter. It should also highlight possible predisposing factors to the development of urological malignancies and revealed gaps observed in knowledge as to why the study was carried out. For example, there is no any publication or official document on pattern of urological malignancies in Calabar. MATERIALS AND METHODS: Instead of using methodology as a caption, kindly replace it with Materials and Methods caption. There is no statement as to how the histological tissues are processed to produced cut paraffin sections at the same time the authors did not specified what staining method was used on the stained sections. How are the histological slides reviewed and what classification and grading system was used in this study have not been captured under this section. RESULTS: There is no a single histological stained slide (photomicrograph) shown under results section to indicate that the authors have worked on histological slides not mere results contained in the patient files. Therefore, there is need for photomicrographs of the most common urologic malignancies in this study to be inserted because the topic of the study is on Histological Patterns of Urologic Malignancies in Calabar. DISCUSSION: The discussion need to be done very well by making scientific comparing of results gotten from this study with other previous studies conducted. Give reasons if possible as to why your results are in agreement with other studies or in contrast with other studies using various factors including environmental, social or cultural factors. CONCLUSION: The conclusion needs to be recast to capture only novel findings in this study not comparing your results outcome with other parts of the country. ethical issues: Some institutions would not have allowed someone to carry this type of research without any ethical approval as indicated by the authors.	The Background has been reorganised to reflect the corrections These have been merged and retitled as Materials and Method The Conclusion has been recast to reflect the corrections The Keywords have been reduced in number The Introduction has been improved to highlight the corrections like previous studies and predisposing factors and the gaps we set out to fill have been properly spelt out. This has been renamed Materials and Method. The procedure of tissue processing and staining as well as the classification system utilised have been highlighted. Photomicrographs of the common urologic malignancies have been added The discussion has been improved to reflect the corrections Not applicable
Minor REVISION comments	The aim of the study can be included in the background of the study or stands on its own.	It has been included in the background
Optional/General comments	I believe adding that information highlighted by me and inserting histological photomicrographs of the most common urological malignancies found in Calabar will make this study to be more informative and resourceful for future use in this scientific millennium.	