

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>

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.	This manuscript is crucial for the scientific community as it offers detailed insights into metal accumulation in prostate carcinoma tissues and its impact on gene expression. By using advanced gene expression technologies, the study reveals how hazardous metals interfere with normal physiological processes and how gene expression patterns can predict cancer aggressiveness. This enhances our understanding of prostate cancer biology and suggests new diagnostic and therapeutic strategies.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Quantitative Analysis of Metal Accumulation in Prostate Carcinoma Tissue: A Comprehensive 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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that you use consistent terminology throughout the document, particularly when referring to "prostate carcinoma" and "prostate cancer." I recommend focusing more on the core findings and their significance in the abstract, while minimizing background information that may not be essential. Briefly mention key methods without jargon. Instead of "We employed advanced spectrophotometric techniques," say "We used standard spectrophotometry to analyze metal concentrations." Clearly highlight main results and implications. For example, instead of "Copper can be toxic in excess," say "Elevated copper levels are linked to increased oxidative stress, indicating a need for monitoring." 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections for sample collection, methodology, and statistical analysis should be organized under the "Materials and Methods" section. Additionally, the subheadings need to be rearranged accordingly. The "Conclusion" section should be retitled as "Conclusions and Future Prospects."	

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript exhibits scientific rigor through its detailed literature review, robust methodology, and advanced analytical techniques like High-Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC). It effectively collects and analyzes demographic and lifestyle data, using statistical models to evaluate the relationships between metal concentrations and prostate cancer risk. The exploration of correlations among essential and toxic metals, alongside dietary influences, further underscores its technical soundness and enhances the overall credibility of the findings. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Several references in the manuscript are outdated, before 2020. It is recommended to incorporate more recent references to ensure the study is grounded in the latest research developments.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The grammar of the article is appropriate for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> While the paper has a clear aim and objectives, it lacks a discussion of the research gap or problem. To enhance the novelty and contextual understanding of the article, it is recommended to include a research gap before stating the aim. The conclusion is well-written; however, it would benefit from the inclusion of future research gaps and prospects. This addition would guide researchers on potential future work and areas that require further investigation. The results are thoroughly written and well-analyzed. Nevertheless, the inclusion of figures, such as bar charts, would enhance the illustration of the data. Specifically, bar charts comparing the concentrations of the selected metals (Fe, Sn, Co, Cu, Mg, Cr, Ni, and Cd) should be added. Additionally, if there are any figures of the tissues used in the study, they should be included to provide better context and understanding. Figure 1 and Figure 2 are not mentioned in the text. To improve the coherence and understanding of the manuscript, these figures should be referenced and discussed within the context of the text. 	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohamed Abdelmonem Abdelfattah
Department, University & Country	MSA University, Egypt