

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 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.

Review Form 3

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>First, in the introduction, expand on TA (demographics and world prevalence) and give at least a brief description of types of TA for the sake of clarity to the reader. Exercise: Add subheadings within the pathophysiology section for key concepts Simplify concepts like heat shock proteins; elaborate on immune mechanisms. Your case presentations should be more specific in its treatment options and address prognosis and where appropriate, follow up. This will allow the reader to appreciate the reasoning behind clinical decisions and result. Followed by a comparative table between TA and diseases with similar presentation in differential diagnosis with distinctive features. Further describe imaging modalities, outlining the pros and cons of each while highlighting the pertinent Doppler findings associated with TA.</p> <p>The treatment part would benefit from a more clearly defined management protocol and discussion of the chronic effects of glucocorticoids. It would also be a value-added to include more recent therapies such as TNF-α inhibitors, and lifestyle management strategies for prolonged management of the illness. Lastly, suggest future research for TA-specific biomarkers and genetic factors to close the gap between the empirical identification of disease and an understanding of its etiology and HLA associations. A flowchart should be added for diagnosis and treatment here to aid readability and logic.</p> <p>These changes aim to enhance the depth of the paper while maintaining its accessibility to both clinicians and researchers.</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)	