

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMPS_103401</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Treatment of Metastatic Prostate Cancer Using Hormonal Therapy: A narrative review</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

### **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.journaljamps.com/index.php/JAMPS/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. This manuscript is a comprehensive, interesting and engaging review of prostate cancer. I think it can be useful especially for urologists in training. It seems like a university master class.</p> <p>2. The title is appropriate for the manuscript.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract I think is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes.</p> <p>5. I think it can be useful especially for urologists in training. It seems like a university master class. The article appears not to have been influenced by any pharmaceutical Company.</p> <p>6. There are too many references. I think more than 30-40 are many.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. The language is fluent and appropriate.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>This manuscript is a comprehensive, interesting and engaging review of prostate cancer. I think it can be useful especially for urologists in training. It seems like a university master class. The article appears not to have been influenced by any pharmaceutical Company. List of missing sections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Abbreviations.</li> <li>- Ethics.</li> </ul> <p>Corrections regarding references:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reference 9: I couldn't find it. It has to be erased.</li> <li>- Reference 22: authors are missing.</li> <li>- Reference 38: the pages are not complete.</li> <li>- Reference 47: congratulations, because this is a interesting reference.</li> <li>- Reference 74: I couldn't find it. It has to be erased.</li> <li>- All references must have a maximum of 6 authors. In case of more than 6 authors put "et al". This happens in the references: 5, 11, 24, 27, 28, 42-46, 48, 49, 52, 59-61, 63-72, 75-77.</li> </ul>	

**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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Cristóbal Ramírez Sevilla</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Fundació Hospital Sant Joan De Déu De Martorell, Spain</b>