Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Journal of Cancer and Tumor International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JCTI_124725**
Title of the Manuscript:	**HEPATOCARCINOGENESIS IN RATS (Rattus norvegicus L.) MALE WISTAR STRAINS INDUCED BY p-Dimethylamino benzaldehyde (DMBA)**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
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.	This manuscript offers valuable insights into hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) using a p-Dimethylamino benzaldehyde (DMBA)-induced rat model. By employing immunohistochemical analyses of tumor suppressor p53 expression, it contributes to a deeper understanding of molecular changes during hepatocarcinogenesis. The study's emphasis on the early detection of liver cancer through specific biomarkers can be highly beneficial for developing targeted therapies. This research can help bridge the knowledge gap in identifying the triggers for HCC, which is crucial given the disease's global burden.	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	The title is fairly descriptive but could be refined for clarity. A suggestion: "Immunohistochemical Analysis of Tumor Suppressor p53 in DMBA-Induced Hepatocarcinogenesis in Male Wistar Rats"	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive, but it can benefit from minor refinements. Consider emphasizing the role of DMBA as a hepatocarcinogen rather than the mention of thrombosis, which seems less relevant in this context. Additionally, highlighting the study's implications for future therapeutic approaches would add more depth.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections are appropriately structured, following the conventional format for a research article. Each section provides necessary information regarding methodology, results, and analysis, making it coherent and easy to follow. However, adding a separate subsection dedicated to the potential clinical implications of the findings could enhance the manuscript.	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically sound. The use of a well-established animal model and ROC analysis to assess tumor progression ensures robustness in methodology. The study offers solid evidence on how p53 expression can serve as a biomarker for early detection of HCC. However, it would be beneficial to include more detailed discussions on the limitations of using the DMBA model and any observed discrepancies in tumor progression between animal models and humans.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. **-**	The references are recent and relevant, providing a solid foundation for the study. However, you may want to include more sources focused on the translational impact of DMBA models for human cancers.	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The English language quality is appropriate, but a few sentences could be clearer. For example, the phrase "DMBA-induced thrombosis" could be changed to "DMBA-induced hepatocarcinogenesis" to maintain clarity.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is well-constructed, but ensuring that the introduction clearly explains the rationale behind using DMBA as a hepatocarcinogen model would be beneficial.	

Review Form 3

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Kelly Osayi Otakhor**
Department, University & Country	**University of Benin, United States**