

# Review of: "The role of pH in cancer biology and its impact on cellular repair, tumor markers, tumor stages, isoenzymes, and therapeutics"

Michael Hausmann<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article "The role of pH in cancer biology and its impact on cellular repair, tumor markers, tumor stages, isoenzymes, and therapeutics" submitted by Maher Ami and Amr Ahmed summarizes several facts known from literature concerning pH and cancer cells. The collection of facts is already mentioned in the headline. In general, the article is nicely written but I have serious concerns regarding publication. I recommend either strong major revision or rejection with the possibility to resubmit an improved version of the manuscript.

1.) The aim of the manuscript remains unclear. Should it be a review or a research article? In the first case, it is unclear why just these aspects, cellular repair, tumor markers, tumor stages, isoenzymes, and therapeutics were selected for this review. Moreover in this case the reviewed literature does not cover the state of the art. In case of a research article, it is completely unclear what was done?

2.) In the introduction the motivation and aim of the article is missing. In chapter 2, last paragraph, it remains unclear where the results come from. Has it been the conclusion of the literature cited before or do the results depend on experiments of the authors. If it is the conclusion of the literature before, it is impossible for the reader to follow without having read all the papers cited.

3.) The quality of the figures is poor. Typos are blurred.

4.) In chapter 3: Do the figures refer just to citation 20 and 21? Or is there any relation to the rest of citations.

5.) The discussion, chapter 6, is a summary of chapter 2-5 and gives the same information the reader has already learnt, just without citations in more compressed form. This is not a discussion. I do not believe that the publications cited are unequivocally the state of science. Usually you will find slightly different results or even contradictions. This should be the subject of a discussion.

6.) Finally in the conclusion, chapter 7, the general statements are again repeated that occur in the abstract and introduction. This is not necessary and does not really help the reader to obtain new insights.