

## 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> 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. This manuscript is important for scientific community as it provides space for further research and it also improves the management of patients with HCV.  Yes. The title of the article is in align with the subject of article.  Yes. Abstract is fine except for SVR should be Sustained Virologic Response but it is written as "stained virologic response".  Fine.  The manuscript is fine.  References are appropriate.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Study is conducted with appropriate protocol.	

### 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:	Prakash R
Department, University & Country	Rajarajeswari Medical College & Hospital, India