

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_103739
Title of the Manuscript:	A study of E-Cadherin expression as a cell marker in benign and malignant breast lesions
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.journalajrs.com/index.php/AJRS/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1.E-cad is an intercellular adhesion molecule. Disruption of E-cad causes alteration of the intercellular junction, and increases cell migration ability, tumor invasion and metastasis. Several studies have evaluated the clinical implications of E-cad inactivation in breast cancer and low E-cad expression indicates a worse prognosis.</p> <p>2.Yes 3.Yes 4. Yes 5. Yes. 6.Yes</p> <p>The following errors are noted in the manuscript:</p> <p>1. Exclusion criteria stated are implied in the inclusion criteria. 2. State the reason for not including patients 15 years and less. 3. In observations and results, "3. Grading of malignant lesions," it is stated that there were 53+47+26 cases, a total of 126 malignant cases. However, number of malignant cases is 63 as mentioned in discussion and abstract. 4. In discussion, "Out of a total of 63 malignant breast lesions, Infiltrating ductal carcinoma Not otherwise specified (IDC NOS) was most frequent, comprising 34 cases". Later, it is written that 19+15+10 =44 cases of IDC were stained for E-cad. 5. In discussion, "We stained cases of carcinoma breast for E-cadherin". What was the staining pattern in malignant cases other than IDC, like infiltrating lobular carcinoma, and other types of breast carcinoma seen in the study? 6. What is the association between grade and E cadherin scoring? 7. In conclusion, "It has a prognostic value in IDC grading". Explain the rationale of arriving at this conclusion.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Umarani M K
Department, University & Country	RIMS, India