

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.	The topic selected is relevant in terms of predicting the incidence of adverse events in patients receiving chemotherapy. Adverse event related chemotherapy withdrawal poses serious challenge in management of cancer patients However, the cost effectiveness of this exercise where DPD enzyme levels are assessed for every patient remains a matter of debate.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No Alternative title suggestion "Assessment of dihydropyridine dehydrogenase (DPD) levels in cancer patients receiving FU based therapy in a tertiary care hospital in Senegal"	
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.	Abstract is not comprehensive Few important aspects are missed viz. -mean age of patients is missing - units missing for age range mentioned eg. Just mentioning 40-50 - Missing information on sample size calculation -Duration/period of study is missing	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	-The scientific accuracy of the facts mentioned in the study can be considered but the fact that there is no clarity on how the sample size was calculated. It is nowhere mentioned that what was the criteria of these 103 patients' selection. -The study claims to be having 83% females then it is quite obvious that cancers common and specific to female population will be more evident in the assessment. -The average Uracil concentration is being mentioned but nowhere the dose of 5_FU is mentioned. The uracil concentration in blood has a correlation with dose of the chemotherapeutic agent - DPD status by age and gender is depicted in the study but statistical significance is being drawn	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are fine	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No, English language quality is not acceptable. Several grammatical errors were observed eg. -Presence DPD deficit -Absence DPD deficit -units for age was missing -expansion of EDTA was missing	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Shruti Jaiswal
Department, University & Country	PES University, India