

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_85731
Title of the Manuscript:	DETERMINING THE ROLE OF IMMUNOHISTOCHEMICAL EXPRESSION OF CK20 IN GRADING UROTHELIAL CARCINOMA
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:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Title: I would recommend you add the setting on your title particularly country</p> <p>Abstract background 4th line – please add “in” after that 6th line – add a full stop after urothelium</p> <p>Methodology: the last 2 sentences are more the same.</p> <p>1. INTRODUCTION</p> <p>Among the infiltrating Urothelial carcinomas, various subtypes like Nested, Microcystic, Micropapillary, Plasmacytoid, Sarcomatoid, Giant cell, Lymphoepithelioma like Lipid rich, Clear cell and Poorly differentiated, are included. The noninvasive urothelial neoplasms are subclassified into Urothelial carcinoma in situ, papilloma, papillary urothelial neoplasm of low-grade malignant potential (PUNLMP), Noninvasive papillary urothelial carcinoma, low grade(LGUC), and Noninvasive papillary urothelial carcinoma, high-grade (HGUC) (6). – I think going into these details is not necessary for the study. The urothelium of the bladder has multilayered epithelium with three different cell zones i.e. i. basal cells ii. intermediate cells zone and iii. superficial cell layer. – the numbering does not make the sentence neat; I would advise we use comma.</p> <p>DISCUSSION Opposite to our findings the male to female ratio of 4:1 was published by a group who included the same number of patients in their research (5) however in another study investigators found male to female ratio of 7.46:1 which is concordant with our results (12). – before this sentence you were supposed to discuss your findinds. But the details above this sentence is more like stating of results. You have done the same throughout your discussion. You state results and compare with other studies. You are supposed to give insight as to why you think you got those results.</p>	Revised
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Very minor preposition errors, please check the language again.	Done
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Please revise the discussion, its important you get it right.	

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	