

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_95473
Title of the Manuscript:	Seropositivity for CMV, EBV, HBV, HCV, and HIV in Leukemia Patients and Its Relationship with Cytogenetic Changes
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:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>YES YES NO – ONE CAN NOT MAKE OUT WHAT RESEARCH FINDINGS ARE – NO CLEAR OBJECTIVE GIVE NO – DISCUSSION TOO BRIEF NOT UPTO STANDARD OF RESEARCH PAPER NO – ONLY 20 REF CITED- KEEPING IN VIEW NATURE OF RESEARCH AND TOPIC IMPORTANCE MORE REF ARE TO BE CITED</p> <p>GENERAL COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise title: make it more meaningful, crispy, and attractive • Delete omit all known, common facts and details beyond the scope of objective • Delete /omit all repetitions • Be precise, to the point - no unnecessary details • Sentences should be coherent, containing precise details and well-constructed • Check for Grammar at places <p>Revise introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write in order ie introduction of your topic, brief historical back ground , epidemiology if applicable, then • Explain your hypothesis properly and in scientific way • Give proper rationale/justification of conducting this study in a scientific way that why you are conducted this study • Give implications of this study on present knowledge and practice in our set up and how this will affect the existing knowledge and skills/practice • Give relevant latest literature review on topic and objective very briefly • Omit / delete all known or common facts already known. • Add objective at the end of introduction <p>METHODOLOGY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Give methodology precisely , briefly with all important details and delete unnecessary steps , in order • Which data or variables collected as per objective and how = give precise details • How data was collected? • Who collected the data? • How Bias in data collection were addressed • Which statistical analysis is done and on which variables? <p>REVISE DISCUSSIONThis is the weakest part of manuscript whereas the discussion is the main body of a research paper in which all results discussed/ compared/ with reasoning and rationale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not written with proper reasoning , rational and in scientific way with out come directed towards conclusion drawn • Discuss each variable/parameter in separate paragraph, Start by giving info that which variable is going to be discussed, than Compare your results with literature, give reasons/justification in a scientific way if they varies Then give outcome of that discussion in last sentence of that para. • Similarly discuss all variables separately • Construct proper sentences with continuity and should be meaning full. • Make discussion directed towards conclusion 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT AT PLACES	
<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:	Ishtiaq Ahmed
Department, University & Country	Isra University, Al-Nafees Medical College, Pakistan