

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80781
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Diagnostic Accuracy of IOTA - ADNEX model in Detecting the Risk of Malignancy in Ovarian Carcinomas
Type of the 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript must describe a technically sound piece of scientific research with data that supports the conclusions. Experiments must have been conducted rigorously, with appropriate controls and sample sizes. The conclusions must be drawn appropriately based on the data presented.</p> <p>Abstract is not well organized, must be concise, descriptive. Abstract Is written by future tense "like <i>This prospective study will be conducted</i>. In abstract, author wrote prospective, however in methods, he wrote cross-sectional. The authors repeated the aim of the study many times in the whole manuscript. Authors wrote "<i>expected results</i>" and <i>positive correlation</i>" where this positive correlation in the result section. Introduction is very long and no concise in the rationale. Methodology <i>is repeated and must be written in a paragraphed form not point</i>. The methods <i>used are not detailed and not mentioned whether these are following any referenced/published methodology</i>. In the result section, where is the demographic characteristics of the patients. The results are not okay to establish the association but that is nothing new given the multitude of papers saying the same. That is why there is no substance in the discussion beyond quoting other studies. The discussion looks more like review of literature. Had the authors tried to correlate with disease severity, characteristics of the tumors/progression of disease or the outcomes it would be interesting. The language is very sloppy. The article could be cut short drastically without losing any effect</p> <p>In brief it is a not very well conducted study with results showing already reported findings and nothing novel.</p> <p>If these comments are amended, the paper will become good, and I accept to publish in your esteemed journal</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Missed reference number 2 and 15. The references must be in the same style.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Alaa Elmetwalli
Department, University & Country	Egyptian liver Research Institute and Hospital (ELRIAH), Egypt