

## 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	Yes, Nowadays there are different novel techniques for breast cancer treatment especially for each molecular subtypes. Therefore, if we can predict it by radiologic imaging, we can help physicians providing personalized treatment.	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Yes	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	Yes	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	Yes The correlation of the all descriptions from BI-RADS lexicon with the molecular subtypes and hormonal status especially shape and margin will make this article more interesting. As a consequence of TNBCs are mostly round and circumscribed from the previous studies.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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:	Somchanin Pipatpajong
Department, University & Country	Chulalongkorn University, Thailand