

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_96606
Title of the Manuscript:	CAN BLOOD GROUP PREDICT THE SUSCEPTIBILITY TO ORAL SQUAMOUS CELL CARCINOMA?
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.journalpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 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. <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. Yes 2. Acceptable, but such titles should usually represent the titles of review articles. The original research articles should have precise and revealing components that reflect the results. 3. Yes but the conclusion must be rephrased as terms like REDAR should be avoided, in my opinion. 4.the table-1 and figure 1 represents same results, so duplication can be avoided and tables related to gender and high risk age group can be made with p values that will lead the results towards scientific conclusions 5. yes 6.yes	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Abbas Saleem Khan
Department, University & Country	Riphah International University, Pakistan