

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)	1. This manuscript is important for scientific community because it discusses microRNA expression in breast cancer stem cells 2. Add the title with literature review because this article is literature review "The role of microRNAs regulated Breast cancer stem cells in the pathogenesis. Prognosis and aggressiveness of breast cancer: a Literature Review" 3. The abstract of the article is not comprehensive. The abstract should contain Background, Purpose/aims, Methods, Results and Conclusion 4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriate. It Should contain introduction, method, results, discussion and conclusion. The arrangement of this article is not systematic and unfocused 5. The manuscript is not scientific correct because the results from table 1. Tumour suppressor Micro RNAs it comes from an unclear journal, it should be self-made based on existing references and where are results that regulated the pathogenesis, prognosis and aggressiveness of breast cancer? There is, you can make a table for each and from the referenced journal. 6. There are 56 references but there are 30 that are more than 10 years old and reference number 50, no year of publication	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English language seems a bit difficult to understand	
Optional/General comments	If this article is made systematically according to literature review standard it will be better	

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:	Fanny Margaretha Laihad
Department, University & Country	Hang Tuah University, Indonesia