



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMPCP_45148
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of DKK1 and NANOG Genes Expression as Prognostic Biomarkers in Iranian Patients with Breast Cancer Using quantitative Real-Time PCR
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	1- The paper title should be as follow: Evaluation of DKK1 and NANOG Genes Expression as Prognostic Biomarkers in Iranian women with Breast Cancer. 2- (Omitting using quantitative real time PCR). 3- In material and methods section: the name and the type of kit used as well as the company supplied it should be written in all steps. 4- In result section: table (1) the title was written as the follow: The primer sequence of the two genes but only one of them is written where the second and GAPDH??? 5- Is the annealing temperature of the two genes is the same?? 6- Clinical information of patients should be presented either using table or graph. 7- Where are the calculations of gene expression??? It is important to put it in order to know how folds the gene was expressed with respect to housekeeping gene (in table form) 8- The two graph of real time PCR is not enough to conduct the exact fold of gene expression and in most cases we don't put it.	The aim of the study and the idea was very important. But there are some comments which are: 9- The reference for the used method was added. 10- The statistical analysis of the study was added. 11- The ethical proof was taken from the patients. 12- The used chemicals were cited and the kits were added. 13- The primers for DKK1 gene were added. 14- The table's legends number 2&3 in the methodology was corrected. 15- In the results the authors mentioned that melt curves for DKK1 and negative control were shown in Figures 1 and 2.
Minor REVISION comments	Over all the paper language is very well , and written by a rationally sequencing	
Optional/General comments	The discussion is small	The discussion was revised.

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)	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The outhur didn't mention If they tack any ethical aproof from the patients they used in the study	The proof was stated.
--	--	-----------------------

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>