

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1. I am concerning about the inclusion part. Since the authors mentioned , it is a cross-sectional study, the punch biopsy result didn't include adeno-epithelium lesions. To my experience, it will always be accidental finding of Adenocarcinoma is situ and even invasive adenocarcinoma in punch biopsy, although the percentage varies in centers. Secondly, if the authors include the adeno-lesions, it will be more convincing to the readers to the application of the Swede score.</p> <p>2. I am wondering about the statistical method. The current usage of swede score is already established using 5 and 8 as cut-off, should the authors compare using 6 or other digits as cut-off? How about the predictive value of the different scores?</p> <p>3. How about the interobserver difference of the same patient rating. I am interested of these data.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>A figure of AUC curve might be helpful for understanding. A short version of swede score might be helpful for readers. Could put some classic colpo images and scores in the article</p>	
Optional/General comments	none	

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>	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yu XIE
Department, University & Country	Gynecology Hospital of Fudan University, China