

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_117083
Title of the Manuscript:	THE CLINICO-PATHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF BREAST CANCER IN MALES: A CASE SERIES
Type of the Article	Clinical Practice Article

## Review Form 1.7

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	  1. Yes, the manuscript provides valuable insights into the clinicopathological analysis of breast cancer in males. Given that male breast cancer comprises less than 1% of all breast cancers, understanding its characteristics is crucial for clinical practice and research in oncology.  2. The title "THE CLINICO-PATHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF BREAST CANCER IN MALES: A CASE SERIES" effectively conveys the primary focus of the study. However, you might consider adding more specificity or uniqueness to the title to make it stand out in academic literature. For example, you could consider a more specific title like "Insights into Male Breast Cancer: A Clinicopathological Study of Cases in Assam."  3. The abstract provides a concise overview of the study objectives, methodology, key findings, and conclusions. However, it would benefit from including specific numerical results or statistical trends to give readers a better understanding of the study's impact. Enhancing the abstract with more quantitative data could improve its comprehensiveness and appeal to a broader audience.  4. The manuscript's subsections and overall structure are appropriate.  5. The manuscript presents a well-documented analysis of male breast cancer cases, including clinicopathological characteristics, immunohistochemical profiles, treatment modalities, and outcomes.  6. It is better to use the most up-to-date reference and check the standard of reference format.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	  This article needs minor English modification.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	  I find this article to be suitable for acceptance after minor revisions. The content is promising, and with some minor adjustments, it will make a valuable contribution to the field.	

Review Form 1.7

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Negar Noorbakhsh
Department, University & Country	Iran