

Review Form2

Book Name:	Medicine and Medical Research: New Perspectives
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2514
Title of the Manuscript:	Anogenital System and HPV-Related Lesions in Women: Anatomy, Pathophysiology, and Screening
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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Although the scope is quite broad, the manuscript provides a clear and robust overview of the anatomical and pathophysiological aspects of the HPV-related lesions in the female anogenital region. It provides a good integration of epidemiological data with mechanistic insights. The structure is logical, and the transitions between sections, from the anatomy and histology, through the viral pathophysiology, up to the epidemiology and screening was well-conducted and seamless.The topic is relevant to the field of gynecological health and HPV-related cancer research, making it appropriate for both clinical and academic audiences.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is clear and accurately reflects the scope of the manuscript. No alterations are suggested.	
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, and properly summarizes the scope and topics addressed in the manuscript.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and well-organized, with a good logical flow. Each section builds on the previous one, guiding the reader in a structured manner through the topics.	
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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust, thoroughly integrating all the topics. The explanation of HPV carcinogenesis is well-founded, properly explaining the role of the E6 and E7 viral proteins; also, the whole chapter draws on a broad up-to-date range of literature.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references used are comprehensive and up to date.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality are generally suitable, and meets the standards for academic publication. It is written in a clear manner, with appropriate scientific terminology.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is well structured, and the data is relevant. But I kindly make some suggestions that could enrich the content, since it is for a book chapter. The manuscript does touch on the prevalence of HPV strains such as HPV16 and HPV18, but could include a more detailed discussion on emerging HPV variants, and their potential impact on current vaccination strategies. Also, the analysis of screening programs could benefit from further depth. While the chapter mentions Pap smears, HPV testing, and vaccination, it lacks a critical evaluation of the challenges faced in screening implementation, particularly in low-resource settings. Thatwould provide a more global perspective on HPV management, specially in poor countries, where the cervical cancer incidence is particularly higher. Maybe, it would also be useful to mention the cost-effectiveness of emerging screening technologies, such as DNA-based HPV testing, compared to traditional methods.	

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:	Willker Menezes Da Rocha
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal Fluminense, UniversidadeEstácio de Sá, Brazil