

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_96653
Title of the Manuscript:	The Role of microRNAs Regulated Breast Cancer Stem Cells in the Pathogenesis, Prognosis and Aggressiveness of Breast Cancer
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/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)	The reference article is a complete and exhaustive REVIEW of the role of microRNA in regulation, development and metastasis in breast cancer. They have reviewed and analysed an extensive bibliography (56 bibliographic citations) and the content of the article is very good, well written and analysed. The article meets all the requirements of a scientific publication. The images and schemes have the source where they were obtained, what they DO NOT HAVE PERMISSION for publication, which could bring us copyright problems (?) Except for this last observation, I suggest its publication to our Journal, since it is a manuscript that will honour the edition.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General 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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Adrian Pablo Hunis
Department, University & Country	Maimonides University, Argentina