

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_101869
Title of the Manuscript:	Transabdominal versus Transvaginal Sono-elastography, which is more valuable in GI-RADS Classification of Different Adnexal Masses?
Type of the Article	Review Article

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><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1-yes Considering that pelvic masses are relatively common problems of women, increasing the accuracy of non-invasive methods to differentiate between benign and malignant masses can help to improve the quality of diagnostic methods.</p> <p>2-yes</p> <p>3-No: In the abstract, it is better to write the method section and the necessary items in it</p> <p>4-yes</p> <p>5-yes</p> <p>6-yes</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p>	<p>The subject of the article is very interesting and the necessary points in the implementation of the study have been well mentioned, but it can be useful to include the following points in the writing of the article.</p> <p>Reviewer suggestions :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Trans-vaginal should be removed from the keywords 2. The purpose of the study should be mentioned at the end of the introduction 3. In the findings section, the table values are repeated in the text. It is better to write only the average and standard deviation about the age and menarche age, and to avoid repetition, mention it only in the text of the article and avoid writing the values in the table. In the text, only the maximum values of laterality, complaints and risk factors should be mentioned. 4. Considering that in the discussion section of the article, it is explained about the comparison of the demographic characteristics of women with benign and malignant masses, it is better to write the demographic characteristics of women with benign and malignant masses in separate columns in the table and compare the results be written in one column with statistical tests (for example, comparing the age of two groups or the complaints of two groups) 5. It is better to remove the type of tests used in the text of the table and specify them below the table using symbols. 6. It is suggested to write the tables as follows: 	

Review Form 1.7

	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Feature</th> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th colspan="2">Mass</th> <th rowspan="2">P-value</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Benign n(%)</th> <th>Malignant / Borderline Malignant n(%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Consistency</td> <td>Cystic / mixed cystic</td> <td>12 (75)</td> <td>22 (91.7)</td> <td rowspan="3">0.17[†]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Solid</td> <td>4 (25)</td> <td>2 (8.3)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>16 (100)</td> <td>24 (100)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Resistive index</td> <td>Mean ± SD.</td> <td>0.35 ± 0.14</td> <td>0.46 ± 0.15</td> <td>0.1[‡]</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>† χ^2: Chi-square test, ‡ t: Student t-test</p> <p>7. It is suggested to delete table 5 by adding a column for histopathological findings to table 4 8. The values of Table 4 are repeated in the text, there is no need to repeat the same contents 9. All study findings such as elasticity score and vascularity should be discussed.</p>	Feature		Mass		P-value	Benign n(%)	Malignant / Borderline Malignant n(%)	Consistency	Cystic / mixed cystic	12 (75)	22 (91.7)	0.17 [†]	Solid	4 (25)	2 (8.3)	Total	16 (100)	24 (100)	Resistive index	Mean ± SD.	0.35 ± 0.14	0.46 ± 0.15	0.1 [‡]	
Feature				Mass			P-value																		
		Benign n(%)	Malignant / Borderline Malignant n(%)																						
Consistency	Cystic / mixed cystic	12 (75)	22 (91.7)	0.17 [†]																					
	Solid	4 (25)	2 (8.3)																						
	Total	16 (100)	24 (100)																						
Resistive index	Mean ± SD.	0.35 ± 0.14	0.46 ± 0.15	0.1 [‡]																					
<p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>yes</p>																								
<p><u>Optional/General</u> 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>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Leila Hashemi Nasab</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Kurdistan University of Medical Science, Iran</p>