

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_99829
Title of the Manuscript:	Unusual clinical presentation of cutaneous squamous cell carcinoma: a retrospective study
Type of the Article	Original research paper/short communication

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)
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)	Ad 1. Yes; in my view, it presents the retrospective study investigating the prevalence of unusual sites of cutaneous squamous cell carcinoma (cSCC) among the patients diagnosed with cSCC. Its purpose and message is to remind clinicians to be aware of the less typical clinical appearance of this type of cutaneous malignant tumor. Ad 2. The title should be more informative, i.e. "The prevalence of unusual clinical presentation of cutaneous squamous cell carcinoma in (the name of the hospital, or the population).....: a 2-year retrospective study Ad 3. The abstract should be more informative about the population and geographic area in which the study was performed, as these data are important as factors that influence on cSCC incidence (exposure to sunlight etc.) (please see Ad 2. – Title Ad 4. Yes Ad 5. Yes; still I would suggest that authors should avoid to express the results in percentages (Figure 2, Table 1), because the number of study participants is very small, or at least it should be mentioned in Discussion section as a limitation of the study Ad 6. Yes	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, with small corrections which are required (typing errors, capital vs small letters errors)	
Optional/General comments	In Materials and methods , the sentence "A histological evaluation was conducted only when the histological diagnosis or microscopic features described were not satisfactory to the investigator" is unclear, did the author wanted to write "clinical diagnosis" instead of "histological diagnosis"? It should be clarified what is considered as histological evaluation or histological diagnosis, it should be added in Material and Method section in brief.	

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:	Vesna Lukinović-Skudar
Department, University & Country	University of Zagreb, Croatia