

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Oncology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJO_99381
Title of the Manuscript:	Cardiac localizations of Hodgkin lymphoma: a case report
Type of the Article	Case study

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.journalirjo.com/index.php/IRJO/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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Structure the summary. It should be included: A brief context, the problem being discussed in the work, the objectives, the methodology and the main results and conclusions.</p> <p>Introduction: The beginning of the introduction should present a synthesis of the proposal, with the reasons that justify the choice of the theme: what motivated him to choose his theme of study, what is the usefulness of the results obtained by the research, what is the purpose of the proposal. A text introducing the subject to be studied should be used, with at least two paragraphs.</p> <p>Methodology: It is necessary for the authors to enter the methodology of the work, which is the description of the detailed path that you will use to explain how you did your research and what methods you used to reach the result. Authors should be aware of the reproducibility of the study and the way it was presented; it is not possible to guarantee that new research achieves similar results. Ensure that if someone repeats the methodology described by you, you can achieve similar results.</p> <p>Results and Discussion: An organized presentation facilitates the reader's understanding of your line of reasoning I suggest that the discussion be inserted, remember that this part is important in your work, because it does show the relevance of your work. In this section you should interpret the data and perform a critical analysis. The objectives and research questions are answered in this excerpt of the work because it establishes a link between what was described in the introduction, with what was found with the use of its methodology. It is necessary to make a critical evaluation of its results, comparing them with findings from similar studies and describe how their data contribute to the understanding or advancement of their field of research. The implications of their results and limitations of their work also need to be described clearly and objectively. However, do not repeat the information already presented or describe new results in the discussion section.</p> <p>Final considerations: Due to the changes that must be made to the rest of the work, the final considerations will need to be rewritten. Remember to make it clear whether or not the study objective was achieved. Write a final paragraph that describes the limitations in the study, as well as suggestions for future work.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Format and insert in the study in the standards of the journal.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I suggest accepting the work, after a few improvements have been made. The study addresses a relevant theme, is with an easy-to-understand writing and will add more knowledge on the subject.</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:	Luana de Oliveira Hernandes
Department, University & Country	Associação Brasileira de Enfermeiros Cientistas, Brazil