

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_84716
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Unilateral Sinonasal Lesions
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Manuscript: There is no flow in the whole manuscript and the manuscript is not specific to get an idea properly. There are many tables that confuse the reader, what the author means. Therefore, it is difficult for a reviewer to focus on the findings and results of the study.</p> <p>Abstract (Line 4-5): "The aim of this study was to observe a much of higher percentage of unilateral sinus pathology." What does it mean? It is not clear what really the purpose of the author is to conduct this study. In addition, there are many studies conducted to evaluate unilateral pathologies. Reasons or factors which make novel this study should be clearly addressed.</p> <p>Abstract (Line 16-17): "right maxillary sinus and nasal cavity were the most significantly affected sinuses in malignant tumor group than both inflammatory disease group and benign tumor group (P = 0.002, 0.001 respectively)". Do these finding "right maxillary sinus and nasal cavity lessons" have scientific background? If yes, please provide reasons to support your study. The rest of the abstract has the same problems.</p> <p>Keywords: "Evaluation, Unilateral, Sinonasal lesions" although are focused but there is no specific reason in the manuscript to support the novelty of these keywords.</p> <p>Introduction: In fact, there is no introduction to this study in the present manuscript. You may need to cite 10-20 articles related to your work and mention that there is space for a novel work that other researchers have not done, and you conducted.</p> <p>In the abstract and some other parts: "inflammatory diseases". The author did not clearly mention which inflammatory diseases.</p> <p>In result Table 1: "20-29 ~ 70-79". Why author divided patients into their 10s? Is there any scientific reason?</p> <p>In result Table 2: "Of all affected sinuses, right maxillary sinus and nasal cavity were the most significantly affected sinuses in malignant tumor group than both inflammatory disease group and benign tumor group (P = 0.002, 0.001 respectively) while left maxillary, right ethmoid, left ethmoid, right sphenoid, left sphenoid, right frontal and left frontal showed insignificant differences in affection among the three groups." I understand the author focuses on unilateral lessons, but what is the scientific base or reason for comparing right maxillary with left maxillary and so on as mentioned here?</p> <p>Discussion: In fact, there is no discussion of this manuscript. Instead of discussing the present research, the author cited many articles. There are more data and results of other researchers in the discussion. On the other hand, there are no citations in the introduction of this manuscript.</p> <p>Conclusion: The conclusion mostly seems like results. The author should reach a precise conclusion and conclude his novel findings if available.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Good effort, but the author(s) need to be more specific in analyzing the data and writing the manuscripts to submit novel results.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Said Ahmad Shah
Department, University & Country	Mie University, Japan