

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.	Identifying cytological abnormalities in women who have unusual discharge is critical for diagnosing infections, detecting early indicators of cancer, and controlling hormone imbalance. Timely and precise cytological analysis is critical for improving women's health outcomes by guaranteeing early intervention and reducing long-term consequences.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suitable	
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.	Comprehensive	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	I recommend addition of broader range of references that explore alternative or opposing viewpoints in the field to strengthen the paper's overall argument and show a comprehensive understanding of the subject.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	<p>The author write about quantitative label-free mass spectrometry which was not significant to his/her study.</p> <p>In the result part the author did not clarify the table is the comparison was done on urine sample or cervical sample (table 1.2.3.4)</p> <p>Also the result part should contain a comparison between the urine sample and the cervical sample (infectious agent, cellularity, Presence of Inflammatory Cells, Cytological Abnormalities..) as the author want to detect if the urine sample is suitable for identification of cytological abnormalities or not (the gold standard method is pap smear)</p> <p>In addition if possible add pictures for the smears</p> <p>The discussion section requires additional improvement since it contains too much information about previous studies without an obvious comparison to the author's work.</p>	

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:	Rayan Sidig Adam Abdelgalil
Department, University & Country	University of Gezira, Sudan