

[Review Form3](#)

Book Name:	Achievements and Challenges of Medicine and Medical Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_4004
Title of the Manuscript:	Cancer Prevention versus Cure: What is our Best Option?
Type of the Article	Book chapter

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.	<p>The abstract emphasizes a preventative approach to cancer research. It highlights the intricacy of cancer formation and recommends a careful reevaluation of present tactics. This viewpoint helps shift research focus toward more economical and significant solutions.</p> <p>The abstract's claim that there may not be a cure for cancer and that all efforts should be focused on prevention could be interpreted as being unduly gloomy, thus downplaying the significance of continued improvements in cancer medicines and therapy.</p>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suggested Title: Reassessing the Priorities for Cancer Research: Moving from Cure to Prevention	

[Review Form3](#)

<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract makes a compelling case for the difficulties in treating cancer and the possible advantages of concentrating on prevention. To make it more thorough, it would be advantageous to include a few extra details and clarifications:</p> <p>Ideas for Enhancements: Contextual Background: Examples of contemporary cancer treatment modalities and their drawbacks could be mentioned in passing in the abstract. This would provide the claim that prevention might be more successful a firmer basis.</p> <p>Preventive Measures: The proposal would be more practical and tangible if it included particular instances of preventive tactics (such as lifestyle modifications, early detection techniques, or immunization programs).</p> <p>Argument Balance: Although the abstract places a strong emphasis on prevention, it appears to minimize the possibilities of new treatment developments. A more impartial viewpoint might result from acknowledging the significance of both prevention and cure.</p> <p>Evidence or Rationale: The argument could be strengthened by briefly mentioning studies or other evidence that back up the claim that prevention is more economical.</p> <p>Positive Framing: The tone of the abstract seems a little gloomy. It may be more interesting and upbeat if the difficulties were reframed as chances for prevention innovation.</p> <p>Proposed Removal: To avoid coming across as unduly contemptuous of current research efforts in cancer treatments, the statement "it is questionable whether such essential biological behavior can be put under our sufficient control to cure cancer" may be softened or reworded.</p> <p>With these changes, the abstract might become more fair, educational, and palatable to a wider readership.</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>Yes but need some improvements as suggested.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not sufficient and requires more new references as given here: add this reference with reference number 5: • DOI: 10.1016/j.ijbiomac.2024.131743 • Add this reference with reference number 6: • DOI: 10.3390/cells13221838 	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Authors are encouraged to include a well-designed schematic diagram to enhance the appeal and engagement of the journal audience.</p> <p>The article is well written and will create audience attraction to the journal but it need one scematic representation and some improvements as suggested. After the revision paper chapter is good and acceptable.</p>	

[Review Form3](#)

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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)</u>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohd Mustafa
Department, University & Country	J.N. Medical College, Aligarh Muslim University, India