



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

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

**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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>2. What about association between PSA levels and GSTP genotype? This should be shown as the values are already available.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>4. Figure 1 is very amateurish looking; should be redone.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>2. Section 3 should just be called "Results."</li> <li>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.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**



SDI Review Form 1.6

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Lawrence H. Lash</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Wayne State University, USA</b>