

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMPCP_127800
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparing Ultrasound Findings to Surgical Outcomes in Thyroid Nodules
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: 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	In this retrospective study, the author clearly explained the significance and importance of using the ultrasound as a firstline non –invasive investigation in the diagnosis of thyroid nodules. It is also established the diagnostic efficacy of ultrasound results in correlation with histological findings after surgery of the thyroid nodules. Overall this study gives useful information on the sensitivity and specicity of the ultrasound investigation as a first line diagnosis of thyroid nodules to rule out the malignant lesions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	My alternate suggesion is “ The Efficacy of ultrasound findings in the diagnosis of thyroid nodules in correlation with histopathology and surgical outcomes ”	
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.	It is comprehensive	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Stands good	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Sufficient	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Good	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Nil	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shyamsunder Kasapa
Department, University & Country	Mahavir Institute of Medical Sciences, India