

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Gynaecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRGY_128544
Title of the Manuscript:	The merit of urine cytology in identifying cytological abnormalities in women experiencing abnormal discharge
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.	Non invasive method for various infectious conditions. But cannot be used as non invasive platform for identifying cytological atypia.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
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.	appropriate	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Discussion part is not properly written.	
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?	yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Discussion part should review the findings of the research. A brief summary should be written, interpretation of result should be there and the findings are compared with previous similar studies. Here in present article, one entire previous study has been copied which is not found to be related with the findings of the present study. Also in this study if both urine And cervical samples were collected for identifying cervical atypia, then what was the sensitivity and specificity of urine samples in identifying the atypia. Result (Tables and figures) does not clearly indicate whether the findings are of urine samples or cervical samples for identifying atypia.	

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:	Deepika Panwar
Department, University & Country	GBH Americal, India