

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Applied Chemistry Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJACR_126099
Title of the Manuscript:	Estimation of selected metals in the tissues of prostate carcinoma patients: A Research
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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

Compulsory 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>
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.	The document contains information of significant value to the scientific community; however, it also presents numerous instances of inaccuracy and erroneous statements. The objective was to ascertain whether various metal activities differed between patients with prostate cancer and non-cancerous control subjects. The results obtained were not attributed to any vague or inconclusive factors. The article included an excessive amount of superfluous information. It should be noted that the vegetarian and non-vegetarian group specified in the result section is not included in the patient selection criteria. A reduction in metal levels has been observed in prostate tissues of patients with arthritis, yet the underlying cause remains unclear. There is a lot of useless information about spectrophotometry, carcinomas and sarcomas. Since the spectrophotometer is a working method, it is sufficient to evaluate it only in the method section. Sarcomas and carcinomas are unnecessary in this article. It would be more appropriate to include more data related to prostate cancer.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I think the title is academically inadequate Assessment of specific metals in the tissues of individuals with prostate carcinoma: A Study	
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 article is adequately summarised and the summary is clear.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The article's subheading distinctions are incorrect. The discussion should be separated from the conclusion. The discussion section should be written in accordance with the literature. It should be compared with the results of other studies. Accordingly, the discussion section should be rewritten	
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. _		
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The text displays a considerable number of linguistic errors and spelling mistakes. It would be advisable to undertake a comprehensive review from the outset.	
Optional/General comments	The article should be written by creating a flow from the beginning. Too much unnecessary information and images are included. The conclusion should be visualised by replacing the spectrophotometer photograph with statistical graphs. Unfortunately, the patient information given in the conclusion is not addressed in the material section. It would be more accurate to use liquid nitrogen instead of -270. It would be more correct to say correlation instead of connection.	

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:	Leyla
Department, University & Country	Gazi University, Turkey