Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAMMR_63724**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Clinico-pathological outcomes of men with initial Likert 2 Multiparametric Magnetic Resonance Imaging of the Prostate: findings from a case series in a non-teaching hospital in UK.**
Type of the Article	**Short 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/journal/10/editorial-policy)

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	----	
Minor REVISION comments	It is well conceptualized study but authors should mention Time interval between index MRI and MRI in which disease was detected What was the frequency of all investigations PSA mentione din table 1 is baseline or at the diagnosi of ca prostate One table of clinical characteristics of patients is desirable (where age, PSA at baseline range and at diagnosis The range of PSA shown is max upto 44 (what was the end result of that patient) because 44 PSa cannot be left for observation??	Thank you for taking the time to review this article, and for the constructive feedback you have provided. We endeavour to make the necessary changes. **Time interval between index MRI and MRI in which disease was detected** We agree with the reviewer's comments and have added a new table, Table 1, to address this and other comments. This new table is highlighted in yellow, and please see below for further details. **What was the frequency of investigations?** We agree with the reviewers comments and have amended Paragraph 2. Methods, to reflect this (highlighted in yellow). **PSA mentioned in table 1 is baseline or at diagnosis of Ca prostate?** **One table of clinical characteristics is desirable (age, PSA at baseline, range and at diagnosis)** We agree with the comments and have added an additional table (Table 1, with the existing Table 1 moving to Table 2) to address these queries. We have also amended the new Table 2 to make clear that these were the baseline values (highlighted in yellow). **The range of PSA shown is max up to 44 (what was the end result of that patient) because 44 PSA cannot be left for observation?** We agree with the comments and have added a comment in relation to this on page 10 of the results section (highlighted in yellow).
Optional/General comments		

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	