

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.	This article is of only moderate importance, as it only discusses results from previous studies.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is suitable.	
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 generally satisfactory, but it could be better by explaining the conclusions reached through the analysis of the studies on AI and prostate cancer.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the structure of the manuscript is 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.	As correction concerns, there are problems to be corrected, which are described below.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references are sufficient and recent. However, I suggest a complementary reference which is described below.	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There were typographical errors through the text. In addition, colloquial words were observed. I suggest a throughout revision of the text concerning the English language.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Below are my recommendations for authors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) The acronym "MRI" should be explained at its first appearance in the text.2) In the "Introduction" section, it would be interesting to describe the main risk factors for the disease and the influence of socioeconomic factors on prostate cancer detection. For example, the authors could cite the article by Souza et al.: "What is the Relation of Lifestyle Habits and Socioeconomic Factors with Prostate Cancer Diagnosis in Brazil?" https://rbc.inca.gov.br/index.php/revista/article/view/4633 which applies machine learning models for the epidemiological study of prostate cancer in Brazil.3) On page 5, verify if the correct sentence is: "12 articles were found in which the study was focused only on prostate cancer and NOT on the application of AI."4) On page 6, in the excerpt "7 studies among the 17 were determined to have low-risk bias, 11 to possess moderate risk bias, and one to exhibit high-risk bias.", was the total number of selected studies 17 or 19 articles? This should be verified.5) On page 8, the acronyms "ANN" and "PSA" should be explained at their first appearance in the text.6) On page 9, the excerpt "artificial neural model" should be placed in parentheses at both the beginning and end of this expression.7) The word "guys" may be considered too colloquial and should be replaced by "men" or "individuals".8) In Table 2, there seems to be a typographical error in the word "summary". The correct form should be "summary".9) On page 12, check if the expression "positivecPSA" contains another misspelling.10) In Table 2, in the summary of (Stephan et al., 2002), verify if the expression "% free prostate screening" should be corrected to "% free PSA screening".11) In the "Conclusion" section, the authors mention the financial cost of treating prostate cancer. The source for these values should be cited in the text and "References". Alternatively, the calculation used to deduce these values should be provided.12) In the "Conclusion" section, the authors state: "However, a more widespread use of AI can undoubtedly aid in lessening this load." To support this claim, it would be more suitable for the authors to mention reference hospitals or research institutions which have successfully used AI to improve the diagnosis of prostate cancer or other types of cancer. This addition could be included in the "Introduction" section as well.	

Review Form 3

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:	Marco Antonio de Souza
Department, University & Country	Universidade de São Paulo, Brazil