

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_95237
Title of the Manuscript:	Diffusion Weighted MR and Dynamic Contrast Enhanced MRI for Characterization of Ovarian Tumors
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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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)
<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. The purpose of this study was to assess the effectiveness of DCE-MRI and diffusion-weighted MRI (DW-MRI) in characterising ovarian cancers and distinguishing malignant from benign tumors, which is important and helpful for scientific community, especially for ovarian tumor differentiation and diagnosis.</p> <p>2. The title "Diffusion Weighted MR and Dynamic Contrast Enhanced MRI for Characterization of Ovarian Tumors" is suitable</p> <p>3. The abstract is quite comprehensive except the abbreviation "US" for ultrasonography which I find quite confusing. I'd suggest using "ultrasound" instead of "US"</p> <p>4. The general structure is clear, systematic. I'd would suggest authors put sub-header for each subsection in Result and Discussion parts, if possible.</p> <p>5. Yes, I think the variable definitions, data calculation and interpretation are scientifically correct</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient and quite recent, however, most of them are from 8 years ago or more.</p> <p>Additional suggestion: I would suggest the authors identify limitations of their study (such as small number of patients), their recommendation for further studies and clinical practice</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript's English should be edited/revised since there are quite a few grammar errors, and the expression could be refined to be more academic</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>None</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:	Bui Vinh Quang
Department, University & Country	Hanoi Oncology Hospital, Vietnam