

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_123994
Title of the Manuscript:	Advancing Prostate Cancer Diagnosis and Treatment Through AI-Driven Decision-Making: A Comprehensive PRISMA-Based Systematic Review
Type of the Article	Systematic Review

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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Overall, article indicating that the introduction is well-structured, theory-based, and provides adequate background information from previous studies. The methods used are generally appropriate for the research objectives. However, some additional clarification would strengthen this section. Specifically, it would be beneficial to: Clarify Specific Details and Symptoms of the cancer. This phrase suggests that the authors are making a thorough, organized, and significant contribution to a particular field of research. The depth of the literature review or how they address gaps in prior research. Overall, this is a high quality manuscript that has implications for</p> <p>Some of the corrections are pointed hereunder:</p> <p>In Table 2, the results of the article may be included and it will be useful further researchers. The review papers may be arranged by the year In Page 2, the font name and size are varying Some of the references are not cited in the text.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>J.Ramesh</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>K.S.Rangasamy College of Arts and Science, India</p>