

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Oncology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AORJ_95462
Title of the Manuscript:	IMMUNOEXPRESSION OF MUTATED BRAF V600E PROTEIN IN PAPILLARY THYROID 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.journalaorj.com/index.php/AORJ/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)
Compulsory 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes but the writing of the reference should be consistent with the surnames, initials of all the patients followed by the title of the article, the journal, the year of publication, the volume(edition): the first page and then the last page of each article and the writing of the references must be consistent.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	The authors should be encouraged to write a full reference as well as they should reflect upon and incorporate the minor changes I suggested as supporting corrections as well as they should include the age that I highlighted in the article which should be shared with the authors. The source of funding should be declared	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anthony Kodzo-Grey Venyo
Department, University & Country	North Manchester General Hospital, United Kingdom