

Review Form2

Book Name:	Medicine and Medical Research: New Perspectives
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2388
Title of the Manuscript:	Clinical implications of tissue carcinoembryonic antigen expression in Ugandan colorectal cancer patients
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Itisawellstructured,thoughtoutandplannedstudy.The rigorousandin-depth method of data collection as well as the efforts done to reduce bias regardingassessmentofhistologicalspecimensiscommendable.Although,thereissomeroomforimproveme ntregardingdataanalysis,andinterpretationofresults.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes,Ithinkthatthetitleofthestudyadequatelydescribesthecontentsofthemanuscript.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Ithinkthatthereshouldbeabetterbriefsummaryofresultsintheabstractsection.Moreover,theagehasbee nwrittenintheformofmedian(standarddeviation) Instead of mean (standard deviation), if it is a normally distributedcontinuousvariable.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes,Ithinkthatthestructureandsubsectionsofthemanuscriptwereaptlydesignedandappropriatelypiecedtog ether.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Overall, the study was sound and conducted following the proper scientific process. However, there was some room forimprovementregardingthedataanalysisanddiscussionsection.Ithinktherewasaneedtoassessthesigni ficanceofintensityof CEA levels with different study variables using a test of significance like ANOVA testing. Furthermore, multiple regressionmodelwouldhavehelpedforbettervaluationofdatainthe presenceofconfoundingvariables.Mor eover,despitethehefty results,theimplicationsandinterpretationsoftheresultswasnotdoneinanextensivemannerwhichcouldbeimp roved.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes,Ithinkthereferencesofthestudyaresuꝑcientandup-to-date.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes,I think that the language of the article was legible and sufficient for the purpose of medical communication.	
Optional/General comments	Despite the overall strengths of the article, I still believe that there is room for further improvement, which would increase the overall yield and impact of the article.	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Umar Nadeem
Department, University & Country	King Edward medical University, Mayo Hospital, Pakistan