

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_91142
Title of the Manuscript:	The Epidemiology of Lung Cancer- How Far Have We Gone?
Type of the Article	Review 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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is not correct to put reference numbers in the Abstract which is the brief summary of the overall contents of the article. 2. The contents in the Abstract should not contain any message outside the main article. This is not the case for the first sentence of the Abstract (which should be shown in the Introduction section as well). 3. The Title of the article is misleading. "How Far Have We Gone" may be interpreted as something we have done in the area of lung cancer which modified the epidemiology of the disease. But the contents of this article is like: "How Much Have We Known", or "How Much Have We Discovered". 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The second sentence in the "A historical overview is difficult to understand: "smoking became popular within soldiers who smoked to relieve stress, in addition to civilians and women at home". What is meant by "in addition"? "What is meant by "women at home". A rephrase may be useful. 2. The last sentence of the first paragraph in the subsection "Development of lung cancer incidence for women versus men over time" should be made more specific. Instead of saying "and <u>this year</u> around 1.5 as many women died of lung cancer than breast cancer in the United States" which is unclear about the writing date or publishing date. The words "this year" should be replaced by "in 2021" or "in 2022" depending on the actual date of writing. 3. The author put the following sentence: "Prevalence of Human Papilloma Virus (HPV) DNA in lung cancer was 13.5% being highest in Asia (16.6%)" under the section on "Genetic Factors". However, the prevalence of HPV is more associated with the existence of the virus and the high frequency of its spreading in the area. It is not so much associated with genetic characteristic. 	
Optional/General comments	The article is useful in summarizing the factors causing or associated with lung cancer. The writing style is a little bit difficult to digest because of the multiple causative factors. Therefore, if the author can produce one summary table before the end of the article (showing the causative factors, gender difference, relative risk, etc.), it will make this article more useful.	

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:	Wiwat Rojanapithayakorn
Department, University & Country	Mahidol University, Thailand