

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_105118
Title of the Manuscript:	The Treatment of Soft Tissue Hydatidosis through an Oncological Approach: A Review of 13 Cases with an Average Follow-Up of 43 Months
Type of the Article	A retrospective analysis

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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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.-I consider that the article, due to its characteristics, is important for the scientific community</p> <p>2.- The Treatment of Soft Tissue Hydatidosis through an Oncological Approach: A Review of 13 Cases with an Average Follow-Up of 43 Months, It is correct because it gives a clear idea of the study.</p> <p>3.- The summary is complete and in a quick reading it gives a clear idea of the study</p> <p>4.- The subsections and structure is logical and consistent</p> <p>5.- The article is scientifically correct, since it meets the methodological requirements for studies of its type.</p> <p>6.- The references are updated, I do not consider adding new ones</p> <p>Desirably this study should be the basis of prospective studies or experimental designs with these drugs.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English need to be improved</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Follow journal guidelines</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Guillermo Yanowsky Reyes
Department, University & Country	Universidad de Guadalajara, México