

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGMB_129268
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of dihydropyridine dehydrogenase (DPD) deficiency in cancer patients in Senegal
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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This research is a prospective study that highlights the importance of screening for dihydropyridine dehydrogenase deficiency before giving fluoropyrimidine. This study holds significant practical implications for cancer patients receiving chemotherapy treatment.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable; however, I recommend incorporating the paper type into the title for clarity, enabling readers to ascertain the study type directly from the 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.	Yes, the abstract of the article comprehensive, I suggest to delete these four words from abstract (Introduction, methods, results, conclusion), these words are not usually written in the abstract.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No, the quantity of references is insufficient, there are also dated references present. I recommend augmenting the reference count and substituting outdated references with more current sources.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language of the article is good and suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	The study is generally good and provides an important scientific addition.	

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:	Amjad Mhanna
Department, University & Country	Tishreen University Hospital, Syrian Arab Republic