

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Oncology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AORJ_92068
Title of the Manuscript:	Biomarker: A potential novel therapeutic target for early detection of Lung cancer
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.journalaorj.com/index.php/AORJ/editorial-policy>)

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>1. The English need improvement since there are some grammatical and syntax errors in the manuscript. For example, the words "which have" may be as "which has"; "available but" as "available"; "to late" as "to the late"; "overview on" as "overview of"; "a data" as "data"; "a sponge like" as "sponge"; "Lungs happen" as "The lungs happens"; "of lungs" as "of the lungs"; "ability to" as "the ability to"; "whether" as "on whether"; "in Lungs" as "in the lungs"; "celled comes" as "cell come"; "large-cell" as "and large-cell"; "helps in" as "help in"; "excess of" as "excess"; "like breast" as "like the breast"; "in left" as "in the left"; "relation with" as "relation to"; "to presence" as "to the presence"; "of lungs" as "of the lungs"; "primary site to secondary" as "the primary site to the secondary"; "colon" as "the colon"; " , bone" as " , and bone"; "rapid" as "the rapid"; "were found" as "found"; "the tumors" as "tumors"; "study from" as "a study by"; "due to cell" as "cell"; "As brain" as "As the brain"; "a control" as "control" ; "As lungs" as "As the lungs"; "diagnosed by" as "diagnosed with"; "benign" as "a benign"; "Vinorelbine" as "and Vinorelbine"; "span were" as "spans were or span was"; "which were" as "which was"; "to inactivity" as "to the inactivity"; " , Interleukin-2" as " , and Interleukin-2"; "the cancer" as "cancer"; "targets fusion" as "targets the fusion"; "key for" as "key to"; "signs on" as "signs of"; "of known" as "of the known"; "new" as "a new"; "Micro-RNA" as "and Micro-RNA"; "serum have" as "serum has"; "carboplatin" as "and carboplatin"; " , Avelumab" as " , and Avelumab"; " , exosomes" as " , and exosomes"; "onset" as "the onset"; " , hexanal" as " , and hexanal"; "such Hsp60, Hsp90" as "such as Hsp60 and Hsp90"; "them with" as "with"; "miRNAs" as "a miRNAs"; "Result" as "The result"; " , miR-93" as " , and miR-93"; "miR-429 were" as "miR-429 was"; "USA" as "the USA"; "unpaired" as "the unpaired"; "sPLA2-IIa" as "that sPLA2-IIa"; "survival" as "the survival"; "a much" as "much"; " , Ribosylation" as " , and Ribosylation"; "for early" as "for the early". The grammar mistakes which are not mentioned here are also to be checked and corrected properly.</p> <p>2. There are some typing mistakes as well, and authors are advised to carefully proof-read the text. For example, the word "suggest" may be as "suggests"; "carbon rich" as "carbon-rich"; "surfactant like" as "surfactant-like"; "helps in" as "help in"; "name suggest" as "name suggests"; "suggest that" as "suggests that"; "act as" as "acts as"; "rapid dividing" as "rapidly dividing"; "EGFR are" as "EGFRs are or EGFR is"; "towards" as "to"; "immune-drugs" as "immune drugs"; "a PD-L1" as "as PD-L1"; "system serve" as "systems serve"; "ANNOVA" as "ANOVA"; "citric-acid based" as "citric-acid-based". The typos not mentioned here are also to be checked and corrected properly.</p> <p>3. The authors are encouraged to include the database, search engines (like PubMed, ScienceDirect, Google scholar etc.), the keywords used etc., which may be included in the introduction section or separately in the materials heading since it is a review article.</p> <p>4. The conclusion section appears to be just a detailed summary of review/observations. Moreover, the authors may be included the limitation of the present findings and future direction for a better understanding of the manuscript.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1. Check the abbreviations throughout the manuscript and introduce the abbreviation when the full word appears the first time in the text and then use only the abbreviation (For example, IGF-1, TGF-β, etc.). And it should be in both abstract as well as in the remaining part of the manuscript. Make a word abbreviated in the article that is repeated at least three times in the text, not all words need to be abbreviated. Abbreviations may be avoided in the keywords.</p> <p>2. The initial cited with reference in the text should be removed and should be in the author instruction of the journal (For example, "J. Lee Villano et al [17]) and it should also be checked all over the manuscript.</p>	
Optional/General comments	The authors have put effort to evaluate the "Biomarker: A potential novel therapeutic target for early detection of Lung cancer". The authors describe the research undertaken with this in an organized manner, emphasizing the results obtained by them. The article needs modification for better cohesion of information to achieve the goal and the minor shortcomings which need to be considered. Hence, the paper can be accepted after MINOR REVISIONS are carried out.	

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:	A. Vijaya Anand
Department, University & Country	Bharathiar University, India