

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_114006
Title of the Manuscript:	High Levels of EFNA2 in Lung Adenocarcinoma Predicts Poor Prognosis
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript provides valuable insights into the role of EFNA2 in lung adenocarcinoma (LUAD) and its potential as a diagnostic and prognostic biomarker. The study utilizes comprehensive data analysis techniques, including survival analysis, independent prognostic analysis, and clinical correlation analysis, to investigate the relationship between EFNA2 expression and prognosis in LUAD patients. The findings suggest that high EFNA2 expression is associated with poorer overall survival and disease-free survival, highlighting its significance in LUAD prognosis.</p> <p>2. The title "High Levels of EFNA2 in Lung Adenocarcinoma Predicts Poor Prognosis" effectively summarizes the main focus of the manuscript and accurately reflects its content. It clearly communicates the key findings related to EFNA2 expression and its prognostic implications in LUAD.</p> <p>3. The abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the study, summarizing the background, methods, results, and conclusions effectively. It highlights the key findings regarding EFNA2 expression, its association with clinical prognosis in LUAD, and its potential as a diagnostic and prognostic biomarker. The abstract effectively captures the significance of the research and its implications for LUAD prognosis.</p> <p>4. The manuscript's subsections and structure are appropriate, as they logically organize the content into sections such as Background, Methods, Results, and Conclusions. This structure allows for clear presentation and easy navigation of the study's findings and analysis.</p> <p>5. The manuscript appears to be scientifically sound, as it utilizes rigorous data analysis techniques and references reputable databases such as The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) and Oncomine. The findings are supported by statistical analysis and correlation studies, enhancing the validity of the results.</p> <p>6. The references cited in the manuscript are sufficient and include recent sources relevant to the topic. However, additional references could enhance the discussion by providing further context or supporting evidence related to EFNA2 expression in LUAD.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article appear to be suitable for scholarly communication. The text is well-written and follows the conventions of academic writing. The authors effectively convey their research findings and methodology using clear and precise language. Additionally, the manuscript adheres to standard formatting and structure expected in scholarly publications. Overall, the language and English quality meet the standards for academic communication in the scientific community. -</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	Overall, the manuscript represents a significant contribution to the field of cancer research, and its publication would benefit the scientific community by advancing our understanding of the molecular mechanisms underlying LUAD prognosis.	
---------------------------	---	--

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:	S. Sathiyapriya
Department, University & Country	SRM Institute of Science and Technology, India