

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_126522
Title of the Manuscript:	Frequency of lymph node metastasis in T3 breast cancer lesions and its correlation with clinicopathological features.
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>

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.		Thank you for the kind comments by the reviewer. This study was highly needed in our setup as Pakistan is one of the regions in the world with highest number of breast cancer patients presenting with advanced stage disease as T3. So assessment needs to be done in order to modify treatment patterns for the better outcomes with decreased morbidity and mortality.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		Thank you for the kind comments by the reviewer. Title has been adjusted as per the advice.
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.		Thank you for the comments. Abstract highlights all the important stuff mentioned in the article.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		All the sections and subsections are made as per the standards.
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.		Thank you for the kind comments. Article has been written as per the standards and on the subject needed to be assessed. All the necessary changes are made in all the sections of revised manuscript as suggested by the reviewer. Title updated, keywords added to abstract. Aim of the study is ore elaborated, definition of axillary level is added in materials and methods, subheadings added in materials and methods. P value significance highlighted in table 4. References updated.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		Thank you for the kind comments. Many old references are replaced with newer ones. Few references couldn’t be changed mainly in the systemic analysis table in discussion section as they are the most appropriate references as

Review Form 3

		needed in terms of facts and figures. And no such recent studies have been done which could replace these old references. Further all the references are rearranged in the chronological order as per the year of study.
Minor REVISION comments		Language has been used as per the standards
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<p>The Title</p> <p>- The Title is preferable to be “The lymph node metastasis frequency in T3 breast cancer lesions patients and its correlation with clinicopathological features”.</p> <p>The Abstract</p> <p>- Excellent and comprehensive for all paragraphs.</p> <p>The Keywords: must be written it at the end of the Abstract.</p> <p>The Introduction</p> <p>- Adjust the alignment of the references within the text in relative to the script lines.</p> <p>- The introduction is not sufficient for the title. You need to add clarification and definition for all the keywords at least write at the end of the introduction the objective of the study or the methodology of the study.</p> <p>The Materials and methods</p> <p>The structure of the manuscript needs some correction to the sentences structure.</p> <p>The Results</p> <p>- Provide the full definition of the abbreviations that have been used in the tables.</p> <p>- Provide the full definition of the abbreviations that have been used in the tables such as * Significant or ** Highly Significant at (Table 4).</p> <p>The references</p> <p>- References that have not been used in scientific research should not be included.</p> <p>- According to the scientific research quality standards guide, it would be preferable if you include more references that have been published within the last Five years because there is only eight from thirty-six that have been provided.</p>	All the details are explained above.

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	No ethical issue noted