

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_114777
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring Prognostic Factors and Survival Rates in Prostate Cancer Patients: A Comprehensive Retrospective Analysis (2009-2018)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1.Yes 2.Title is correct. 3.Abstract is short and comprehensive. 4.Structure is appropriate. But why the study is so old? what about the data from 2018 till now??? 5.Correct. 6.References are sufficient and cited properly in text. Other comments – Graphs are not visible properly. Correct them.	4. Thank you for your comments and for the opportunity to clarify why the study covers the period from 2009 to 2018, with follow-up until 2020. The primary aim of our research was to evaluate prognostic factors and survival rates in prostate cancer patients, which required an extended follow-up to obtain robust and meaningful data. While including more recent data beyond 2018 would be valuable, our current resources do not allow for a new study period or contacting patients from 2020 onwards without additional funding. We appreciate your understanding and hope to explore more recent data in future research when resources permit. 6. thanks for the review. We've improved the quality of the graphics and sent them as a separate file.
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	