

Review Form2

Book Name:	Medicine and Medical Research: New Perspectives
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2345
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of metastatic cutaneous deposit from Malignant Tumors
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript tackles a crucial clinical problem: diagnosing metastatic cutaneous deposits from malignant tumors using Fine Needle Aspiration Cytology (FNAC). The study is significant for the scientific community as it highlights the early detection of visceral malignancies through a minimally invasive and cost-effective method, potentially improving patient management and prognosis.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Including the word "cytology" in the title could make it more specific and reflective of the study's focus on Fine Needle Aspiration Cytology. This would ensure that readers immediately understand the diagnostic method being evaluated. Revised Title Suggestion: "Evaluation of Metastatic Cutaneous Deposits from Malignant Tumors Using Fine Needle Aspiration Cytology"	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive, offering a succinct overview of the study's aim, methods, results, and conclusions. To enhance it further, the authors could emphasize any novel aspects of their findings, making the study's contribution to the existing literature more explicit.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well-organized, with appropriately structured subsections that guide the reader through the study's methodology, results, and discussions. The logical flow is maintained throughout, and the use of tables and figures effectively supports the presented data.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimumof3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, with a well-described methodology that ensures reliable results. The findings are supported by statistical analysis and are discussed in the context of relevant literature, demonstrating the study's contribution to the field of oncology and cytology.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent, providing a solid foundation for the study. However, the inclusion of a few more recent studies, particularly those that explore advances in FNAC techniques or related diagnostic tools, could further strengthen the manuscript.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language used is appropriate for scholarly communication, but minor revisions could improve clarity. For example, simplifying complex sentences and ensuring consistency in terminology would enhance readability.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript presents a thorough and clinically relevant study. While the focus is clear and the methodology sound, the authors might consider expanding the discussion to explore potential future applications of FNAC in other metastatic conditions.	

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:	Chandrashekhar Indoria
Department, University & Country	Bharat Ratna Late Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee Memorial Government Medical College, India