



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Cancer and Tumor International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JCTI_19696
Title of the Manuscript:	A retrospective study of 137 dysplastic nevi: Are a personal history of melanoma and other histopathological factors associated with high-grade cytologic atypia?
Type of the Article	Original Research 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	What is in the table should not be repeated in the text, because it is self-explanatory. This makes the reading tiring and the article long.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>L48: replace H&E by heamatoxylin and eosin (H&E). L123: Replace "In Table" by "In Table 1" and number the table.</p> <p>L165-184 There is a large literature review in this part of the discussion. Please, use only the main conclusions of the authors.</p> <p>Ex: "After reviewing 6275 nevi with 169 architectural disorder, Arumi-Uria et al. concluded that the risk 172 of melanoma increases as the grade of atypia increases".</p> <p>L161, L209. L181, L215 "We think" is not scientific language. Please, delete them and rewrite the sentences if necessary.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It is a well written paper with very relevant topic.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Sandra Aparecida Marinho</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>State University of Paraiba (UEPB), Brazil</i>