

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_99707
Title of the Manuscript:	Pretreatment Predictors Associated with Improvement in Hepatitis C virus Related Decompensated Cirrhosis After Direct-Acting Antiviral Therapy
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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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 The manuscript is important for scientific community, since the research question is looking at solving problems among patients with Hepatitis C Virus. 2 Title is suitable for the article. 3 Abstract is sufficient. 4 Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate but needs to be compressed. 5 The information of their findings is beneficial scientifically, but author needs to carry out these corrections for acceptance. 6 References are sufficient for this article, but with few errors. It is important that references are cited properly and based on publisher's format.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language of the article is suitable.	
Optional/General comments	Generally, this article contents needs to be summarized. Recheck table 1 for percentages. Some tables need to be merge such as Table 4, complete table 4 and table 7. While table 9 can be compressed into table 6 Badawi et al. Chen et al. [17, 18]: should be Badawi et al. [17] and Chen et al. [18] Reference number 8 is the same as 27 while 7 and 26 are the same. Effect all corrections.	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Adedokun Amudatu Ambali
Department, University & Country	Fountain University, Nigeria