



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_35678
Title of the Manuscript:	Caveolin-1 gene, hyaluronan and CA 15-3 as Potential biomarkers for diagnosis and prognosis of primary breast cancer
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	It is interesting to link Caveolin-1 gene expression to CA15-3 and hyaluronan protein level in blood sample through liquid biopsy. However, there are some concerns which will undermine the conclusions: 1) What is the internal control for Caveolin-1 PCR? What is the cutoff for Caveolin-1 positivity? Is real-time PCR or other semi-quantitative PCR applied? 2) Why is there not post-surgical follow up of Caveolin-1 in blood specimen, in parallel with hyaluronan and CA15-3?	The cutoff for Caveolin-1 positivity measured by quantitative real-time PCR but in our study, Cav-1 gene analysis was performed by thermal cycler PCR method (semi-quantitative PCR) We wrote the post-surgical follow up of Caveolin-1 in blood specimen, in parallel with hyaluronan and CA15-3 in the discussion section at line 265
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The sample size is relatively small for a common tumour like breast cancer.	In our community the follow up of patients is very difficult due to distant residence from hospital and many samples were missed during follow up.