

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Cancer and Tumor International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JCTI_121410</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>USING INDUCED PLURIPOTENT STEM CELLS TO MODEL GYNECOLOGICAL CANCER HETEROGENEITY IN BREAST AND OVARIAN CANCER</b>
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community as it presents an innovative approach to modeling gynecological cancers using iPSC-derived models, which can more accurately capture the heterogeneity and complexity of breast and ovarian cancers. By highlighting the variability in therapeutic responses and molecular characteristics between the cancer models, the study offers valuable insights into personalized treatment strategies. I appreciate the manuscript for its potential to bridge the gap between traditional cancer models and the clinical realities of tumor diversity, potentially leading to more effective and individualized therapies. However, the study could further benefit from including patient-derived iPSCs to enhance the relevance and applicability of the findings in a clinical context.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>Yes, the title "Using Induced Pluripotent Stem Cells to Model Gynecological Cancer Heterogeneity in Breast and Ovarian Cancer" is suitable as it clearly reflects the study's focus on utilizing iPSCs to explore the heterogeneity of breast and ovarian cancers.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive, covering the study's objectives, methodology, key findings, and implications. However, it could benefit from a brief mention of the specific types of functional assays performed to assess invasive and migratory capabilities, as well as a clearer emphasis on the potential impact of these models on personalized medicine. Additionally, summarizing any limitations or areas for future research could provide a more balanced overview.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear appropriate, as they logically progress from the introduction of the problem, through the methodology, to the results and their implications. The inclusion of detailed sections on differentiation protocols, functional assays, and gene/protein expression analyses ensures clarity and depth. However, incorporating a separate discussion section to more explicitly interpret the results and their broader significance could enhance the manuscript's overall coherence and impact.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound due to its well-defined experimental design and use of established protocols for differentiating iPSCs into breast and ovarian cancer cell lineages. The thorough validation of differentiation through specific markers, alongside the use of functional assays to assess cancer-specific behaviors like invasiveness and drug sensitivity, supports the reliability of the findings. Additionally, the detailed gene and protein expression analyses provide strong evidence for the model's relevance to actual patient tumors, further demonstrating the study's scientific rigor. The careful consideration of tumor heterogeneity and therapeutic response also adds to the manuscript's credibility and significance.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> :</p>	<p>The references provided are both sufficient and recent, with most sources published within the last five years, reflecting up-to-date research in the fields of iPSC technology, cancer modeling, and gynecological cancers. The inclusion of key papers on iPSC applications in cancer research, as well as specific studies on breast and ovarian cancers, ensures that the manuscript is well-supported by current literature.</p>	

### Review Form 3

<u>Minor REVISION</u> comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language and English quality of the article appear suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript is written in a clear, formal, and precise manner, which is appropriate for a scientific audience. Technical terms are used correctly, and the structure of the sentences supports the conveyance of complex ideas effectively. If there are minor language issues, such as awkward phrasing or punctuation errors, these could be easily addressed with a final proofread. Overall, the language quality should meet the standards expected in scholarly publications.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Good Manuscript	

### **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>T Purushoth Prabhu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>The Tamil Nadu Dr MGR Medical University, India</b>