

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_122685
Title of the Manuscript:	Advanced Approaches and Future Innovations in Urine Toxicology: Safeguarding Against Sample Manipulation
Type of the 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 (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 review talks about various developments to stay ahead of emerging manipulation techniques in urine toxicology that impacts diagnostics, clinical and legal proceedings. This includes omics as well that gives a deeper metabolic and proteomic insights to drug metabolism. This review gives an informative summary on the integration of chemical adulterant detection, biomarker analysis, advanced spectroscopy, and artificial intelligence (AI) to improve the urine tests.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes , the title of the manuscript is as per the review content.	
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 as well as the review should include the details of the paper taken into consideration while writing this review that includes the years range.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The review is desgined carefully with proper sections and subsections.	
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.	The review covers in detail the methods of sample manipulations and advances in detection technology along with details on onsite testing devices and certain clinical studies and future directions as well. It thoroughly discusses the topics providing deeper insights into the topic.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References can be improved by adding more reference for NMR based metabolomics approach and proteomics approach. They can add recent metabolomics papers such as https://doi.org/10.1089/met.2024.0038 , doi: 10.7150/ntno.79394 Or any other refernces that the author prefers.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is appropriate for scientific publications.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

[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:	Swarnima Pandey
Department, University & Country	University of Maryland, United States