

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_82884
Title of the Manuscript:	Colposcopic evaluation of cervical lesions with swede score and its correlation with histopathology
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.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><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In the methods section you state that score above 8 is suggestive of cancer. From my knowledge, score above 5 is suggestive of high grade lesions and score above 8 has specificity of 90% for CIN2+.</li> <li>- You included 162 patients in almost 2 years. These are all patients with suspected cervical abnormalities, unhealthy appearing cervix, recurrent vaginal discharge, or post-coital bleeding? The number seems low. I would recommend stating how many patients were eligible for inclusion and how many were finally selected. What was the reason for non-inclusion and state more specifically inclusion and exclusion criteria.</li> <li>- Was data obtained retrospectively or prospectively – please explain.</li> <li>- The first part of the results – you could make a table with baseline characteristics, it would be more transparent. I leave this decision with you.</li> <li>- If you start the sentence with the number, it should be written as a word.</li> </ul>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<p>Dear authors, I believe the manuscript is well written and important for low-economy settings. I would recommend an English language revision by a native speaker – perhaps the journal can offer this. The only drawback is that the topic is not new and was already evaluated multiple times in the literature. Because of this I would consider changing the title and focus a bit more on the importance of a simple scoring system that can be used without additional funding or maybe as one of the options for screening in low-income countries.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Andrej Cokan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University Medical Centre Maribor, Europe And University of Maribor, Slovenia</b>