

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_73395
Title of the Manuscript:	CARCINOMA OF BREAST: A CASE REPORT
Type of the Article	Case study

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:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>ABSTRACT Dates are not important here as the document may become obsolete</p> <p>INTRODUCTION The introduction lacks references and contains several statements that should be supported by references. The introduction seems too long with academic information, as if it were a course for medical students. The author would benefit from narrowing down the details and focusing on what is particular about the case he is reporting. The author claims that "Cancer is the second leading cause of death in the world", which is not true, according to the WHO, the two leading causes of death in the world are cardiovascular disease and accidents cerebrovascular. Here the author would certainly like to speak of the second leading cause of cancer death after lung cancer, but the reference must be clarified. The introduction should state the case to be presented and the purpose of this case report.</p> <p>CASE PRESENTATION The author should make the case presentation impersonal, avoiding expressions such as "my patient" Current medical data : In this part, the author uses information already given in the previous part. He should review to avoid repetitions. This also applies to the abstract. Medical background : The author says the patient has completed 4 cycles of chemotherapy. It is necessary to specify for what reason, the type of cancer for which the chemotherapy was carried out. What follows lacks logic, it is difficult to know how many fine needle aspiration were done? The author presents initially a diagnosis of carcinoma of upper outer quadrant of right-side breast, then later the diagnosis of metastasis of breast at the same place, we are confused. If it is an ipsilateral metastasis of a mammary carcinoma, this should clearly appear and should then constitute the interest of this case, if not the paper lacks interest since it is already known that in more than 90% of the cases the breast cancer of the woman is carcinoma.</p> <p>DISCUSSION The discussion should be revisited after reorganizing the presentation of the case. Also need some references in the discussion. The elements discussed did not come out well in the presentation of the case, especially the link between diabetes and breast cancer.</p> <p>CONCLUSION The author's conclusions do not reflect the content of the clinical case. The author goes to generalizations about the contribution of his clinical case. This case did not deal with prevention at all.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	Tchaou Mazamaesso
Department, University & Country	University of Kara, Togo