

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80179
Title of the Manuscript:	Correlation of Gleason Grading System and nuclear parameters by nuclear morphometry in patients of Prostatic Adenocarcinoma: A study Protocol
Type of the Article	Study Protocols

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The manuscript entitled "Correlation of Gleason Grading System and nuclear parameters by nuclear morphometry in patients of Prostatic Adenocarcinoma: A study Protocol" claims the use of prostatic nuclear morphometry as a more precise, objective diagnostic tool to identify and staged prostatic adenocarcinomas than the one commonly used by most clinicians. This is an interesting, potentially very useful and overall well-constructed proposal that may deserve further consideration to be published after major improvements are conducted. First of all, it requires serious English editing. I would suggest the editors to run software to detect plagiarism; there are paragraphs that have perfect English syntax and grammar. There is inconsistency in the verb tense use throughout the text. Sometimes is used in future, others in present. Ethical issues and documents must be disclosed (e.g., Permit No), as patients' informed consent forms. The method used to select the histological material to be scrutinized and to determine sample size must be disclosed and described in detail. The anatomo-pathological description of the sampled piece must be commented. Guides and criteria to obtain the histological samples must be disclosed. The contingency table based on which new and old samples were chosen must also be presented. The statistical design must be thoroughly explain. What are the variables to be contrasted between methods? How will authors evaluate data distribution? I would also recommend the authors to diagram the study design. Lastly, I would recommend authors to contrast both diagnostic techniques in the introductory remarks. To me, the discussion and interpretation section must be eliminated, and the limitation must be introduced in the methods section (i.e., study design).	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	Gabriel Gutiérrez Ospina
Department, University & Country	Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México