

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_121840</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Emerging Markers and Technologies in Urine Sample Validity: A Brief Review of Detection Methods and Applications</b>
Type of the Article	<b>review</b>

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

[Review Form 3](#)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This review is of interest to clinical laboratory assistants, doctors, and researchers in terms of evaluating the reliability of urine analysis and its composition in order to obtain a conclusion that can help in making a diagnosis and identifying various disorders in the body.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	I completely agree with the title of the article, as it reflects the essence of the review	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	The abstract is fully comprehensive, but I suggest to exclude from it the sentence: "... <b>the development of non-invasive and point-of-care testing methods offers immediate and accurate results, making these techniques more accessible and practical</b> " because: firstly, it just the common idea for all new methods and non- specific for urine and, secondly, urine testing is commonly but not always a non-invasive method and demands with new technic some time and trained staff.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Yes, the structure of the manuscript is appropriate	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript contains references and an analysis of scientific publications that have already been accepted by the scientific community, have proven their adequacy, possibility of use and usefulness to address the issue of the reliability of urine samples and the identification of various components in it. In my scientific work, my colleagues and I use some of these methods in laboratory studies to identify certain substances in urine after experimental seed of rats.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	In my opinion, the authors have provided a sufficient amount of literature to consider modern methods of urine analysis	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Yes, the English language is quite suitable for communications	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Unfortunately, the authors did not consider the role and methods of studying such important components of urine as basic cations and anions, which are often crucial for making clinical diagnoses and conclusions. <b>I consider it necessary to add such a section to the manuscript.</b>	

### Review Form 3

#### **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>Roman Aizman</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Novosibirsk State Pedagogical University, Russian Federation</b>