

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_103685
Title of the Manuscript:	Human papillomavirus (HPV) prevalence in oropharyngeal cancer in Brazil: a systematic review with meta-analysis
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.journaljamr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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> <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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes the manuscript is important to the scientific community as HPV has been associated with oro pharyngeal cancers especially in patients without any deleterious habits like tobacco.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable. However, it is better to include the type of HPV in the title as OSCC cases are mainly associated with HPV 16 and 18.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct. However, it is highly recommended to mention the type of HPV assessed in each study.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient and recent.</p> <p>7. In the results section, it is mentioned "11 cross sectional studies, 7 cross sectional studies, 3 cohort, 3 retrospective and 1 case control study". The authors have included only 13 articles for this systematic review. There is a discrepancy in the above statement.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jayanthi P
Department, University & Country	Azeezia College of Dental Sciences and Research, India