



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u>
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Very interesting & useful review article. Some spelling mistakes must be revised , e.g (crbriiform) Also fewer structural mistakes e.g[] no 8 must be added . Collective statistically different study may be added May the authors tell us about the place or country of each study included in this review. Arrows at the figures should mentioned the place ectopic structure. What about prognosis of these cases .	The spelling has been changed to Cribriiform 8 has been inserted into the empty box to make it [8] Because of the sketchy nature of the reported cases and the non-availability of detailed information on all the reported cases such a suggested collective statistically different study would not be possible for me to do. The country of some of the reported cases has been included the remaining ones are from usa but one needs to be sure but in my opinion the country or origin is not necessary and it is my view that the suggested country of origin should be removed and that at times it is only the abstract that is available so please in my opinion let us remove the source I cannot provide arrows; the pathologist whose case it was did not provide arrows but only provided the legends. Information on the reported cases is sketchy and varied and at times lacking and because of the fact that the details of the full paper are not available to me but information would indicate a



SDI Review Form 1.6

		benign behaviour it is because of scarcity of reported cases one cannot be certain regarding the biological behaviour and prognosis that is why the paper has been written to alert clinicians about the condition and recommend that such cases should be reported and after the report of a large number of cases the true biological behaviour would be known. I cannot therefore provide anymore details
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	All references must be written in similar methods .	Reference [] has been changed to [8] where the number 8 was missing
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Very good articles	