

[Review Form 2](#)

Book Name:	Achievements and Challenges of Medicine and Medical Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3690
Title of the Manuscript:	Discovery and Validation of a Novel Biomarker for Cancer
Type of the Article	BOOK CHAPTER

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 manuscript is significant to the scientific community as it provides innovative insights or data that advance our understanding of a critical research area, potentially influencing future studies or clinical applications. Its methods or findings could address existing gaps, propose novel biomarkers or therapies, or introduce advanced technologies. I appreciate this manuscript for its rigorous methodology, clarity in presenting results, and the way it effectively contextualizes its findings within the broader scientific landscape. Such work not only fosters intellectual curiosity but also lays a foundation for tangible benefits in healthcare or other applied fields.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I think it could be improved. Discovery and Validation of a Novel Biomarker for Prostate Cancer	
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, it is.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, it is.	
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.	This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness through its well-designed experiments, use of appropriate controls, and adherence to established research protocols. The conclusions drawn from the data are logically supported by the results, and the manuscript appropriately contextualizes its findings within the current body of knowledge, reflecting a deep understanding of the topic. This careful approach enhances the manuscript's scientific merit and makes it a valuable contribution to the field.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, it's convenient. There is a confusion in the referenas styles between chapters. One chapter uses author names and the other chapter uses numeric style and frankly, I couldn't see the references in that numeric style.	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes, it is.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	I added notes to the main text, adding where corrections/ clarifications were needed.	

[Review Form 2](#)

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Leyla Bozdag
Department, University & Country	Gazi University, Turkey