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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
An interesting case report with well manuscript written.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Its interesting and rare case. The discussion contains many repeats like features, All may be integrated and discussion needs to be relevant and shortened. 1. The flow of the case summary needs to be in order. 2. “The woman underwent total abdominal hysterectomy with bilateral salpingo-ooophorectomy” This statement is repeated twice. 3. Is there any TNM classification? Any LN status? 4. Any follow up period, may be mentioned. 5. “associated with pregnancy and oral contraceptive use” repeated in discussion. 6. Only 1 differential- if any other, do mention. 7. Similar things like Features, clues, etc are repeated in various statements. These can be integrated and much of the discussion text can be curtailed. 8. Figures are too many; max 8 best figures to be included. 9. What is the prognosis/outcome of these types of tumors ? How do they behave? 10. IHC markers specific to each subtype may listed properly which help to differentiate between the two ?
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Thank you for this well presented and well written interesting case report highlighting an uncommon but potentially perilous area in gynaecological pathology when dealing with limited samples. Please address the following: 1) Include a table comparing the useful features separating MGH from MGA. 2) Update your reference and discussion from the old WHO classification to the 5th edition. Is this still a recognised variant pattern in the WHO book? 3) Please see this article and include the following immunohistochemical stains in your discussion. Stewart CJ, Crook ML. PAX2 and cyclin D1 expression in the distinction between cervical microglandular hyperplasia and endometrial microglandular-like carcinoma: a comparison with p16, vimentin, and Ki67. Int J Gynecol Pathol. 2015 Jan;34(1):90-100.