

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Oncology Research Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AORJ_91379</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	Role of plasma Progastrin phenotypes as a potential biomarker for screening and diagnosis of cancer - A Scoping Review
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:

(<https://www.journalaorj.com/index.php/AORJ/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>This authors have tried to gather evidence relating to the role plasma Progastrin phenotypes as a potential biomarker for screening and diagnosis of cancer in this scoping review.                      The manuscript needs to be checked for spelling, grammar and punctuation.                      The authors can refer to the JBI methodology for scoping review to understand to write the manuscript better.                      The abstract should be under the headings:  <b>Objective</b>  <b>Introduction</b>  <b>Inclusion criteria</b>  <b>Methods</b>  <b>Result</b>  <b>Conclusion</b>                      This scoping review should come under the headings:  <b>Introduction</b>  <b>Review Question</b>  <b>Inclusion criteria</b>                          Concept                          Context (<i>geographic location, specific racial or gender-based interests or details about the specific setting</i>)                          Types of sources (Types of studies)  <b>Methods</b>                      Specify if you are conducting your review according to any methodology like JBI. Scoping reviews should follow Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR), which should be specified.                          Search Strategy                          Source of evidence selection (If any bibliometric software was used, Line 80-83 can be included here after sentence reconstruction))                          Data extraction                          Data Analysis and Presentation  <b>Results</b></p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>“ProGRP” should be written in the text in the same way. In some places it is written as pro GRP                      Line 15: due “to” their (add “to”)                      Line 28: correct the spelling of “interest”                      Line 39: spelling mistake – it should be “intended” instead of “indented”                      Lines 43-50 is not required.                      Line 51: It is not Research question, but “Review question”                      Line 53: Not required                      Line 58: Why studies published only in the last 10 years are considered?                      Line 59: Were all analytical study designs included? If not specify, which were included.                      Line 81, 82: The sentence do not have clarity                      Line 89: The Prisma flow chart for scoping reviews is given below:</p>	

**Review Form 1.6**

	<pre> graph TD     A[Records identified through database searching (n = )] --&gt; C[Records after duplicates removed (n = )]     B[Additional records identified through other sources (n = )] --&gt; C     C --&gt; D[Records screened (n = )]     D --&gt; E[Records excluded (n = )]     D --&gt; F[Full-text articles assessed for eligibility (n = )]     F --&gt; G[Full-text articles excluded, with reasons (n = )]     F --&gt; H[Studies included (n = )]     </pre>	
<p>Identification</p> <p>Screening</p> <p>Eligibility</p> <p>Included</p>	<p>Table 1 should include the country where the study took place and also the study design. Patient characteristics like gender, age.  <b>References:</b>                  DOI number or unique database identifier number can be included.                  183: Change the bold font.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Sunu Alice Cherian</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Pushpagiri College of Dental Sciences, India</b>