

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Oncology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AORJ_98631
Title of the Manuscript:	ULTRASONOGRAPHY EVALUATION OF HORMONE RECEPTOR STATUS AND MOLECULAR SUBTYPES OF MALIGNANT BREAST MASSES
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.journalaorj.com/index.php/AORJ/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>The paper subject is actual and is based on the latest diagnostic and therapeutic strategy of the breast cancer.</p> <p>The ultrasonography cannot evaluate the hormone receptor status or the molecular subtypes. Indeed, the ultrasonography features can be correlated with molecular subtypes. The title has to be modified consequently. The abstract contains relevant data specific to the conducted study.</p> <p>The manuscript is structured in a correct manner, containing all the necessary subsections.</p> <p>Yes, the study is conducted in a correct manner.</p> <p>The references are recent and well correlated with the text.</p> <p>Figure 3 – more precise delimitation of the lesion and better description is necessary. Figure 5 and 6 – has to be marked as A and B images and described separately in the legend.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English of the article need to be improved	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Nedelcu Alin Horatiu
Department, University & Country	"Grigore T. Popa" University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Romania