

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Surgery</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_122510
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF STRAIN ELASTOGRAPHY WITH HISTOPATHOLOGICAL EXAMINATION FOR AXILLARY LYMPH NODE ASSESSMENT IN BREAST CANCER PATIENTS</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript holds significance for the scientific community as it investigates the potential of strain elastography as a non-invasive alternative for evaluating axillary lymph nodes in breast cancer. This approach could potentially reduce the reliance on invasive surgeries. While it shows promise in enhancing patient comfort and diagnostic efficiency, further research is necessary due to its moderate specificity. Although there are alternative techniques, such as Sentinel Lymph Node Biopsy (SLNB), Axillary Lymph Node Dissection (ALND), Ultrasound-Guided Fine-Needle Aspiration (FNA), and Positron Emission Tomography-Computed Tomography (PET-CT), these methods tend to be more expensive for patients.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is generally suitable, indicating the study's purpose, methods, and target population.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive, and it is good</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The total sample size of 42 patients is relatively small, which may limit the generalizability of the results. A small sample size can also increase the variability of the estimates, leading to less confidence in the findings</li> <li>2. The data lacks additional clinical details (e.g., tumor stage, patient history) that could provide context for the results and their implications in practice.</li> <li>3. The formatting of the tables in the results section needs to be modified, and statistical significance must be added to all the results mentioned, whether positive or negative.</li> <li>4. The study does not include comparisons with other imaging modalities (e.g., MRI or CT), which could provide a more comprehensive assessment of the diagnostic performance of strain elastography.</li> <li>5. Adding histological images could enhance the study by providing visual confirmation of the findings</li> </ol>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness by employing a prospective observational design to evaluate strain elastography for axillary lymph node assessment in breast cancer patients. By using histopathological examination as the gold standard, the study provides reliable comparisons of diagnostic accuracy. The detailed reporting of sensitivity, specificity, and predictive values enhances the understanding of strain elastography's capabilities. Overall, the findings align with existing literature, underscoring the manuscript's technical soundness and relevance in breast cancer diagnostics.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Using only eight references in a manuscript is insufficient, whereas expanding the reference list would strengthen the manuscript's scientific rigor and contextual relevance. It's advisable to include more citations to thoroughly cover the topic and validate the findings.</p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, but need for few editing	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### **PART 2:**

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mohamed Fares Mostafa Mohamed</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Azhar University, Egypt</b>