

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_123559
Title of the Manuscript:	Patterns of breast lesions in Western Sudan
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Understanding the pattern of breast lesions and having a high index of suspicion for breast malignancies when patients present is important to both the patient and the surgeon. It will lead to early diagnosis, can be used to predict future breast diseases and therefore, patient monitoring. There should be an improvement in the rationale of this study.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	To some extent. Ideally, the pattern of a pathology should include both the clinical and histopathological characteristics. This work is devoid of the clinical characteristics of the various breast lesions.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	It is comprehensive enough but there are some repetitions of words and typographical errors that need to be corrected.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Largely	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The methodology lacks full description of histopathological protocol and should be rewritten. There should be a subheading on data collation and the author should outline the data obtained and how they were collected. Lack of information from the extracted data, on presenting complaints, duration, tumour size, and to an extent, histopathological features and immunohistochemistry results is a big minus. It will be good to include them as much as possible. In patients with both preoperative biopsies and excision biopsy/mastectomy histopathology results, which ones did the author include in the study? If both, for a particular patient, that will be duplication. In cases where the preoperative biopsy result for a particular patient is different from the postoperative specimen result, which one did the author use? How was that decision made and how did the author reconcile both? Who reported the histopathology? Consultant pathologists or senior registrars? Did they use common documented criteria for reporting? Kindly state the criteria used in reporting these breast lesions. For Instance, invasive carcinoma NST and invasive ductal carcinoma are used in different classification systems. In the discussion segment, the author should discuss how the risk factors for breast cancer in this study compare with other studies and give appropriate references. Are there specific risk factors for male breast cancer? What are the risk factors of the other lesions other than breast cancer? Is fibroadenoma a long-term risk factor for breast cancer? If yes, which subtypes of fibroadenoma? Is there any that the surgeon must follow up for a long time? What does one see in phyllodes tumour etc?	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	They are recent. More can be added based on the adjustment in the discussion	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Needs some improvement	
Optional/General comments	The approval reference number should be written out in the methodology section. Statements on how patients' confidentiality was ensured and adherence to the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki should be made.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Esteem Tagar
Department, University & Country	Nigeria and Ambrose Alli University, Nigeria