

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Oncology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AORJ_108845
Title of the Manuscript:	Radiological and histopathological diagnosis of pulmonary mass according to CT-guided FNAC and core biopsy
Type of the Article	

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>Yes. Interventional radiology guided procedures and diagnostic imaging should be complementary and not competing modalities. Histological diagnosis although the gold standard can't be often performed due to haemodynamic condition of the patient. In such a situation radiology guides and distinguish malignant from non malignant lesions. FNAC being less invasive is preferred.</p> <p>Comparative analysis of radiological and histopathological diagnosis of pulmonary mass</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>1. For type of study only prospective is mentioned whether it is case control or not 2. Basis of doing FNAC or biopsy 3. More clarification on "negative for malignancy" and how it is different from non malignant lesions 4. Statistical significance of results if not done have to mention as descriptive study</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Indranil Sen
Department, University & Country	Apollo Multispeciality Hospitals, India