



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Medical and Pharmaceutical Case Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJMPCR_45145
Title of the Manuscript:	Primary breast lymphoma with delay response to treatment: a case report
Type of the Article	Case study

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	<p>INTRODUCTION section Is well written and concise.</p> <p>CASE REPORT section Is well written and concise. However, authors should give us information about clinical stadium of the disease, was it CS I E, was it B or A symptomatic disease, than aalPI or IPI score should be calculated. No evidence of bone marrow biopsy</p> <p>DISCUSSION section First sentence is undefined, I don't understand what authors wanted to point out? Primary breast lymphoma is rare entity according to increasing frequency of primary breast lymphoma (8). Second sentence is undefined as wellThe disorder should be considered as a differential diagnosis of- with other breast malignant disease- I think authors should read ESMO guidelines for extranodal lymphomas so they have to comment on OS or PFS in the case of PBL which has unfavorable prognosis. Authors should point out on the PET/CT as golden standard for response evaluation, especially in the cases of diffuse large B cell lymphoma. Even they only performed MR of the breast they need to comment on aspects of treatment evaluation methods.</p> <p>CONCLUSION section Well concluded</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Authors should read ESMO recommendations for Extranodal lymphoma,	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ivan Petkovic
Department, University & Country	University of Nis, Serbia