

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Oncology Research Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AORJ_102695</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Immunohistochemical Features of Prostatic Carcinoma in Southwest Nigeria; A Ten-Year Retrospective Study</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research 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.journalaorj.com/index.php/AORJ/editorial-policy> )

**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)
<p><b><u>Compulsory</u></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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. <b>The manuscript is crucial for the scientific community as this provides the insights into the prostate carcinoma, a common malignant tumour in males. This is a retrospective study comprising immunohistochemistry of cancer cells.</b></p> <p>2. <b>Yes, the title is suitable for the manuscript.</b></p> <p>3. <b>Yes, the abstract is comprehensive.</b></p> <p>4. <b>Yes</b></p> <p>5. <b>Yes</b></p> <p>6. <b>The references are sufficient. The STUDY TECHNIQUE part is missing refences.</b></p>	
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p><b>Yes, the quality is appropriate for the scholarly publications.</b></p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>	<p><b>Editing of text and references is required to be done.</b></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**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>Rajandeep Kaur</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School Division Winnipeg, India</b>