

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80108
Title of the Manuscript:	Well Differentiated Villoglandular Papillary Adenocarcinoma of The Cervix: A rare case report
Type of the Article	Case report

### 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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>This is a case report of a histologically rare subtype of cervical carcinoma. The histological descriptions are sparse. You should use and refer to WHO definition of this tumor. What are the main criteria? Differential diagnoses? Pitfalls? It is possible that the primary is in uterine cavity or ovary? Characteristic immunohistochemical markers?</p> <p>Usually there is also a cytological smear. Was this the case here? What was the diagnosis? Impact of cytological diagnosis?</p> <p>Figure 4 is not in focus.</p> <p>The discussion is mainly clinical, not histopathological</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Ref. 5 is an article in Norwegian. Did you really read it?</p> <p>I don't quite see that this fits with a pharmacological journal. Consider sending a revised version to a pathology journal which accepts case reports. Also, if you have the prebiopsy cytology, it would be much more interesting for a cytopathology journal.</p>	

### 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Torill Sauer
Department, University & Country	Akershus University Hospital, Norway