



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_5101
Title of the Manuscript:	Histological imaging of gastric tumors by scanning acoustic microscope
Type of the Article	Research paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The aim of this study is to evaluate the utility of scanning acoustic microscope (SAM) in gastric tumours. The authors analyzed the different characteristic of gastric tumours in SAM and listed the benefits of SAM over discrimination by light microscopy (LM). SAM seems a new diagnostic modality for gastric tumours, but this study provides very few valuable information for us. And the conclusion is not based on the results.	According to the suggestion, we have revised the manuscript as much as possible.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	(1) Abstract: the conclusion is lack of evidence. We can not draw the conclusion based on the results. (2) Line 63, Page 6: "unstained sections were soaked in distilled water for at least 3 h to fully expand the tissue to the original state" Distilled water is hypotonic, Whether the specimen will be swelling in distilled water for at least 3 h? Whether this will affect the speed-of-sound (SOS) of the specimen? (3) In clinics, what we focus on is the nature of lesions for specimens. But we can not confirm the nature of lesions by SAM. Therefore, I think SAM is not very valuable.	(1) In abstract conclusion, "(2) repeated observations of the same section are possible, even after staining " Since no image data after staining was not provided, so we have deleted the last portion as follows; repeated observations of the same section are possible (2) Because deparaffinized sections repeled water due to surface hydrophobicity and dried out easily, it was necessary to soak sections enough in distilled water to reduce hydrophobicity. So deparaffinized, unstained sections were soaked in distilled water for at least 3 h before observation. We will add the above sentence in the text, Page 6. (3) All tissues have their own speed-of-sound (SOS) by which ultrasound travels through them. The SOS is usually proportional to the tissue



SDI Review Form 1.6

		elasticity. Even after formalin fixation, the specimens usually keep their elasticity in the same order as their original unfixed ones (Supplemental Fig. 1). Table 1 and Figure 3 showed particular SOS of each lesion or component of stomach, so that imaging from SOS reflected each tissue character of objective elasticity compared with palpation hardness. We will add the above sentence in the text, Page 13.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		