



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_47755
Title of the Manuscript:	Correlation of <i>GSTP1</i> polymorphism with severity of prostate cancer in an Eastern Indian population
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Manuscript is rather sloppily prepared- many instances of incorrect spacing and poor grammar. There are also many poor word choices, e.g., the use of "restrict" in the Abstract is not appropriate. 2. What about association between PSA levels and GSTP genotype? This should be shown as the values are already available. 3. Description of inclusion and exclusion factors for cases and controls seems appropriate. However, it might be useful, rather than just stating that "histopathology and PSA measurements" were used to include subjects, to add some description of what values or characteristics are typical of prostate cancer. 4. Figure 1 is very amateurish looking; should be redone. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Incorrect spacings and grammatical mistakes have been revised. The word 'restrict; has been replaced in the Abstract as advised. 2. PSA is increased in both BHP and CA prostate and there is a considerable overlap of PSA concentration between the two groups. Moreover, its changes are exhibited in a serial manner with progression and treatment of prostate cancers even in the same histopathological grade. Hence, although we kept the PSA as an additional screening tumour marker with the histopathological grading as the major definite criteria for selection of prostate cancers, we selected the more definitive histopathological grading in the form of Gleason's score and ISUP grading only for studying the linkage of GSTP1 SNP with the severity of prostate cancers in the present study. 3. As advised the cut off values of PSA for the screening purpose has been mentioned as 4 µg/L in the Material and Method section with the suitable reference for selecting it as a cut off value. 4. As advised Figure 1 has been redone.
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are also several incorrect statements or conclusions. For example, calling GSTs "tumor suppressor proteins" is incorrect. Not sure it is correct to state that GSTP is "the most widely distributed" isoenzyme of GSTs. 2. Section 3 should just be called "Results." 3. Results, para. 2: The P value seems quite low considering the values are so close and the SD values. I just find this difficult to believe it is correct. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As GST suppresses the carcinogenesis by quenching the free radical carcinogens, it has been stated as the tumour suppressor protein. However, as advised we have removed the phrase 'most widely distributed isoenzyme' for the GSTP1. 2. As advised, the section 3 has been renamed as Results. 3. As advised, we have rechecked our statistical analysis and it was found to be correct.
Optional/General comments		



[SDI 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>	