|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| Book Name: | [**Medical Science: Trends and Innovations**](https://www.bookpi.org/bookstore/product/medical-science-trends-and-innovations-vol-1/) |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms\_BPR\_4466** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **EARLY DISEASE DIAGNOSIS USING FTIR SPECTROSCOPY IN BODY FLUIDS ANALYSIS** |
| Type of the Article | **Book Chapter** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| PART 1: Comments | | |
|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **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 manuscript is important as it highlights the significance of FTIR spectroscopy in detecting biomarkers and enabling early disease diagnosis through body fluid analysis. As a non-invasive and rapid diagnostic technique, FTIR offers a cost-effective, one-time investment solution that requires minimal time for analysis. Additionally, it eliminates the need for reagents and chemicals, making it a sustainable and efficient alternative to conventional diagnostic methods. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | Yes, it is suitable |  |
| 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 comprehensive |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | Yes, it is scientifically valid. The paper seems to be scientifically solid based on the information supplied, as it provides pertinent details on the use of FTIR spectroscopy for body fluid analysis in the early identification of disease. It accurately highlights the benefits of FTIR, such as its quick analysis, non-invasiveness, and capacity to identify illness biomarkers. It also makes use of current research and well-established scientific ideas, which makes the results applicable to the diagnostic and biomedical domains. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.**  **-** | It is okay. |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Overall satisfactory |  |
| Optional/General comments | A statement on page 6, paragraph started with dementia with Lewy bodies (DLB*),* lacks definitiveness and seems over-speculated without sufficient supporting evidence. The use of ***may*** *distinguish* makes the claim over generalized and non-conclusive. Providing validation data or specific accuracy metrics would have strengthen the argument and enhance clarity. A more precise assertion, backed by empirical evidence, would have improved the credibility of the statement. I will suggest to avoid using “**may’** from the statement. Using such paraphrase undermine the credibility of the claims. So, it is good to reduce speculative phrases. If the author is uncertain of findings, it’s better to avoid such statement. Also, it would have been better if authors had enlightened us on accuracy and precision of the instrument. Overall, it is good. |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reviewer Details:** | |
| Name: | **Roshan Prasad Yadav** |
| Department, University & Country | **Louisiana Tech University, USA** |