

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Oncology Research Journal |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AORJ_102695 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Immunohistochemical Features of Prostatic Carcinoma in Southwest Nigeria; A Ten-Year Retrospective Study |
| Type of the Article | Original 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:

(<https://www.journalaorj.com/index.php/AORJ/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) |
|--|--|---|
| <p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p> | <p>Yes, I consider that it makes an adequate synthesis of the topic with some deficiencies that could be resolved with some adjustments.</p> <p>Yes, it seems correct to me</p> <p>I would have liked the objective to have been made explicit in the summary, perhaps at the end of the first paragraph.</p> <p>And.</p> <p>At this point I have doubts, since the objective pursued is not made explicit at any time, this leads to the weakness of not being able to be certain that the conclusions are adequate.</p> <p>This is a weak point of the work, since I understand more recent works should be cited. I leave a link where I perceived that there could be articles that could be useful. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/?term=Immunohistochemical+Prostatic+Carcinoma&size=100&filter=datesearch.y_5</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | | |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Gabriel Tapia |
| Department, University & Country | Universidad de la República, Uruguay |