



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Oncology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJO_49426
Title of the Manuscript:	Benefits of Docetaxel for Metastatic Castration-Resistant Prostate Cancer Sudanese Patients and the Effective Number of Cycle and Dose (2013–2017)
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	The retrospective study reported in the manuscript was aimed to determine the optimal number of cycles of docetaxel plus prednisone in patients with metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer, through the evaluation of a number of parameters, such as performance status, prostate-specific antigen response and pain. Results are interesting, with important implication for clinical research and public health, however, before its publication, the manuscript needs a revision of English, given the presence of numerous grammar errors and unclear and/or incomplete sentences. Discussion, in particular, requires to be improved, since it is often not clear when the authors referred to the results of the study and when to those of previous investigations. In the manuscript, I highlighted some errors together with specific comments.	The manuscripts was revised and reviewed by native English speaker The typographic mistakes were corrected Sentences was completed grammar errors was corrected Additional points and details to improve the discussion were added -the discussion was edited, revised and reviewed Highlighted errors was corrected All comments were revised and reviewed
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u> Ethical approval was obtained from Institutional review board of Omdurman Islamic university- Faculty of Medicine. Data were collected after taking the necessary agreement from Khartoum State Ministry of Health as well as from Khartoum center for Radiation & Isotopes (RICK).	No ethical issues.