

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Oncology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJO_86647
Title of the Manuscript:	What is the carcinoma detection rate in patients with indications who had digitally guided transrectal biopsy? Analysis of 194 prostate cancer patients from Nigeria.
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:

(<https://www.journalirjo.com/index.php/IRJO/editorial-policy>)

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	Classification of Gleason score such as Well, moderately or poorly in figure 3 is not appropriate ISUP grades should be given "The PCa detection rate in our study was 34%. The detection rate is lower than a similar study by Ogbetere <i>et al.</i> ¹⁷ in Nigeria which reported PCa in 65% of patients that had prostate biopsies." How can the authors explain this inconsistency? Two different results are mentioned in the text in terms of relation of poorly differentiated bx scores and age. First it is mentioned that there is no linear correlation but then an increased frequency of high gleason score with age is reported	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The classification has been defined on the tables2. The PCa detection rate in our study was 34%. The detection rate is lower than a similar study by Ogbetere et al.¹⁷ in Nigeria which reported PCa in 65% of patients that had prostate biopsies." How can the authors explain this inconsistency?.....That was our observation and hopefully we would explore the reason3. This has been rectified
Minor REVISION comments	Font of the table 1 is different from the rest and the other table. Also there are font differences in the text in discussion part.	Fixed
Optional/General comments	This paper adds nothing new to the literature	

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>	