

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_99894
Title of the Manuscript:	MOLECULAR VARIANTS OF HUMAN PAPILLOMAVIRUS AMONG INDIVIDUALS ATTENDING HEALTHCARE CHECKUP IN EVERIGHT DIAGNOSTIC AND LABORATORY SERVICES OWERRI, IMO STATE, NIGERIA.
Type of the 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.journalacri.com/index.php/ACRI/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. Suitable</p> <p>3. Yes, comprehensive but is too long with un necessary data in the background section and the discussion section in abstract is repeated should be minimized into line or two including the most important conclusion</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. No, the reference is too old more 2 decades (only one reference in 2021 in the author compare his results with reference data incorrectly, there are 2 references in the reference list which is not cited in the manuscript text.</p> <p>"In the discussion section must compare the study results with recent 5 years or at most the last 10 years, otherwise the author just report the study results with suitable interpretation supported with robust analysis from textbooks with new editions"</p> <p style="text-align: center;">"The author should follow the reviewer's comments"</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maysaa Khadhim Al-Malkey
Department, University & Country	University of Baghdad, Iraq