

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80281
Title of the Manuscript:	DOPPLER INDICES EVALUATION IN M ALIGNANT BREAST LESIONS-REVIEW ARTICLE
Type of the Article	REVIEW 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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Breast ultrasound is a very useful tool for diagnosing breast carcinomas." - authors opinion 2. "Ultrasound of the breast can be classified as a screening or diagnostic test. The goal of screening is to detect breast abnormalities in a large area of undiagnosed patients, and the purpose of diagnostic ultrasound is to perform tests that focus on diagnosing a symptom or symptom, such as mild discomfort, or abnormalities noted in previous imaging conditions." - it needs to be reformulated 3. "The use of ultrasound has shown an amazing promise of differentiating the benign from malignant lesions. Recently introduced, the sonographic BI-RADS lexicon has demonstrated its usefulness in distinguishing risk from solid masses." – the conclusion of study 5) is: "that malignancy grade can be slightly to moderately predicted" 4. Misquotation: 6) - it is not found in the manuscript 5. "Folkman originally proposed the link between angiogenesis (the creation of new blood vessels) and cancer in 1971" – not found in references 6. "According to Cosgrove et al. (1993)" – not found in references 7. (Birdwell et al. 1997). – not found in references 8. " DS can be very helpful for people with asthma due to their surface area" - authors opinion and no relation with reference 9) 9. "Although sonography has historically been used to diagnose cystic lesions in solid wounds, there has been a growing interest in using sonography to differentiate the risk from solid tumors and to avoid biopsies due to its ability to identify lesions with traumatic traits. Sensitivity to sonography has been found to be higher than mammography especially in the premenstrual breast. Today, sonography plays a key role in guiding interventions such as needle aspiration, core needle biopsy and local pre-biopsy and needle" - authors opinion 10. Materials and methods, Results 11. "according to WHO statistics" – not found in references 12. "It can have genetic as well as non genetic factors leading to metaplasia of normal cells turning them malignant." - authors opinion 13. "obviating the need for invasive investigations in patients" - authors opinion, the study 14. "According to the findings, ultrasound with Doppler may reliably distinguish malignant lesions from benign ones, obviating the need for invasive investigations in patients." – the study 18) states that US+Doppler+elastography can reliably differentiate focal benign and malignant breast lesions 	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>15. References 24) to 27) are not discussed in the manuscript.</p> <p>16. The conclusions do not result from this review.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1. Written check: spaces between words; Doppler – capital letter;</p> <p>2. Misquotation: 4) authors and page numbers</p> <p>3. Misquotation: 7) – page numbers</p> <p>4. CD - unexplained abbreviation</p> <p>5. Misquotation: 8) authors</p> <p>6. Misquotation: 9) – page numbers</p> <p>7. Misquotation: 10) – page numbers</p> <p>8. Misquotation: 12) – page numbers</p> <p>9. Misquotation: 17) – journal, date, pages</p> <p>10. Misquotation: 17) – journal, date, pages</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The manuscript needs serious revisions especially in discussions part.</p> <p>The wording denotes superficiality.</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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nedelcu Alin Horatiu
Department, University & Country	"Grigore T. Popa" University of Medicine and Pharmacy Iassy, Romania