



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJMMR_18101
Title of the Manuscript:	Ectopic prostate in the uterine cervix A Review of the Literature
Type of the 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:

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



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	PSA can react positively in carcinoid tumors also can be positive in some bladder cancer and in many rectal tumors(shared same cloacal derivation of prostate and rectum . According to table one no of cases is 52 while in the conclusion it is 72 ?????????? . Ref 7 data not available . Ref 11 No solid confirmation that all cases were ectopic prostatic tissue . Comment on fig 1 is the same as comment on fig 2 ??? (1)x40 no need. (2) x100 no need .	Thank you your contribution PSA can react positively in carcinoid tumors also can be positive in some bladder cancer and in many rectal tumors(shared same cloacal derivation of prostate and rectum has been incorporated as additional statement in the end. Less than 70 has been changed to few Ref 11 contains a report of one case I do not understand the statement no solid confirmation that all cases were ectopic tissue if you highlight the place in the paper I would indicate it. The pathologist who kindly sent me the figures made the comments on the figures 1 and 2 I cannot change it. Because the two figures represent low and higher magnification pictures of the same specimen the original pathologist indicated it in the event that you still feel it is not necessary then please add higher magnification view of figure 1 to legend of figure 2; I have kept it as the pathologist gave me. Since ectopic prostatic tissue is rare it would be extremely difficult to confirm that all the cases were ectopic prostate tissue considering the fact that MDT discussions and reviews may not have been done in these cases; I can only bring to clinicians the possibility of ectopic prostate in cervix so that in the future similar cases are thoroughly investigated and discussed; If



SDI Review Form 1.6

		there are additional sentences that must be inserted anywhere please highlight it and I would appreciate it or if there any phrases that should be used to clarify ambiguity please let me know so that I can effect it. Reference 7, details of this case is not available to me because I have not got access to the full paper? Do you want me to remove it from the list? Even though the details are not available to me in order to insert into the table but 1 case was reported and diagnosed as ectopic prostate which I want to point out.
Minor REVISION comments	Ref 11 total no is 36 the positive is only 13 in deep need for explanation	I do not understand this statement please clarify this. Please if there is something missing I have overlooked please let me know and I would insert it.
Optional/General comments	In the table Kelly et al is no 11 wrong it is no 12	Kelly et al [12} has been inserted it has been changed from [11] to [12] Thanks for identifying it.