

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_119144
Title of the Manuscript:	Indocyanine green compared to technetium-99m in sentinel node detection in breast cancer: A single-center retrospective study
Type of the Article	Retrospective 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.journalajrs.com/index.php/AJRS/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"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The topic of the manuscript is very important and interesting, since the authors have used optical methods for diagnosis in clinical trials and also compare with standard techniques. The scientific community needs these evidences to establish new approaches to cancer treatment/diagnosis.</p> <p>The title of the work is appropriate for the main manuscript.</p> <p>The abstract provides the necessary information about the manuscript.</p> <p>The subsections could be improved, especially in the discussion, since they were not completely connected to each other and more information could be also added, such as: How was the final concentration of ICG defined? The manuscript is a retrospective study, then it could be scientifically correct, however, more information about the protocol needs to be added.</p> <p>The references are recent, but as I mentioned above, the manuscript needs more information and more references probably be needed.</p> <p>Questions and comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- What statistical analysis was performed in this study? Please, provide this information in the main manuscript. 2- Describe some information about ICG, e.g. excitation and emission, because only information about the infrared camera was described. What characteristics make the ICG better than TC99m? What was the uptake of ICG? How long after injection was it possible to observe fluorescence? 3- Did all patients receive TC99m and ICG? If yes, why aren't there separate groups (e.g. Tc99m, TC99m+ICG and Just ICG)? Please, clarify in the methodology, this information is confusing. 4- Regarding table 1: Clarify the information and add the total of the patients (n=11) at the end. 5- What criteria were used for the final concentration of ICG? Was this amount for each injection's point or was it fractioned? 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes, but I suggest a general revision of the manuscript for clarify the information.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The subject is interesting; however, the main manuscript could be clearer and better structured with more information about the protocol and procedure.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Camila Ramos Silva
Department, University & Country	IPEN, Brazil