

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_105613
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge about the relation between human papillomavirus (HPV) and oropharynx squamous cell carcinomas (OPSCC) among university students - a systematic review and 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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript covers an exploratory topic related to the knowledge of infectious diseases in post-secondary students. The authors employed a systematic review and meta-analysis approach to address the research question. While the theme and main analysis seem appropriate, this manuscript has serious issues in its presentation of methods, results, and interpretations. Further, the manuscript lacked sufficient context/motivation, logical organization of findings, and reasonable explanation/interpretation of the results. Consequently, the manuscript fails to meet the minimal standard of any academic scientific journals.</p> <p>2. The title abides by the standards of systematic review/meta-analysis. Abbreviations should NOT be used in the title.</p> <p>3. The sections and structure of the manuscript appear to abide by a standard Introduction-Methods-Results-Discussion format. However, there are several serious issues such as:</p> <p>Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The context of the diseases were stated but was not tied into the research themes and questions. • Introduction section lacked sufficient, relevant information about the disease and the research question. Some paragraphs included brief statement of facts that do not cohesively introduce the research context. <p>Methods section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Duplicate section 2.5 and 2.6 on statistical methods. • Section number "2.5" was used twice – numbering error <p>4. The abstract of the manuscript is full of error in English grammar, punctuation, and standard language usage – and is unacceptable for publication in any journal. Please consult an English language expert.</p> <p>5. The manuscript has serious issues in the presentation of context (motivation of the study), methodology (the use of computational tools), and interpretation of results/findings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation of Context: See my comments to Question #3 above. • Methods : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The literature search methodology appears standard. ○ As a systematic review / meta-analysis study, it is generally expected that there are multiple reviewers. Who / How many reviewers conducted the literature search and curation was not clearly stated. ○ The statement of the use R programming has issues: First, the language used should be R not R Studio (even though the latter is your programming environment/software). Second, the specific details (e.g. functions or list of procedures) as to how the R package was used were missing. ○ The PRISMA workflow diagram (Figure 1) should be referenced in the Methods section as well. ○ Quality Assessment approach via the Y/N checklist raises concerns. The authors did not clearly explain the rationale behind it and should consider citing additional references (e.g. prior studies that employed similar approaches). ○ The details of the main Meta Analysis and Sub-group Analysis should be included as a dedicated sub-section of the Methods. ○ The authors should include a brief statement to introduce the concept, purpose, and/or utility of "funnel plot" in summarizing Publication Bias. • Analysis/Interpretation of findings: 	

Review Form 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Heterogeneity and Publication Bias were done properly, but need to be described in the Results section with more detail. ○ The authors stated that “R studio...accepted worldwide”, which is an irrelevant and misleading way to justify their methods. <p>6. The References / Citations of the manuscript needs improvement. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The authors cited background publications but failed to properly include and paraphrase sufficient contextual information that motivated their research study. • The Quality Assessment procedures should be properly justified. The authors can achieve this by referencing studies that motivated their current approach, or studies with similar approaches. • The same goes for the decision on heterogeneity – the authors claimed that the heterogeneity is high. While I agree it is the case, for a broad readership, the authors should consider referencing published studies and/or guidelines to justify their claim. • Citations of the last 3 paragraphs of the Discussion are missing – concern with validity of the claims and potential plagiarism. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The use and command of the English language is poor and unacceptable for publication.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grammar: Inconsistent use of present tense vs. past tense • Structure (especially the Introduction): poorly structured • Word choice and usage: Need improvement <p>It is mandatory that the authors of this manuscript consult an English language expert to review and revise their work before publication in any journal.</p> <p>The Introduction and Discussion need serious work. The context and motivation were not described at all. There are also missing citations in the Discussion sections (mentioned above) which raises concerns of plagiarism.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Table 1 needs to be better presented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The title “Characteristics of the studies” is not the best title. Please use a title such as “Published studies included”, along with additional details in the table legend. • The logic of sorting isn’t clear. Is it by country, sample size, study type, year, or some other criteria? Unsorted tables are difficult to read. It is acceptable to state the logic of sorting within the table legend. • Since the “Total number of students” is already given as a column, the authors should not include a separate column “students who knew / total”: just “students knew (n, %)” would be sufficient. <p>The main and sub-group meta-analysis results associated with Figure 2 are the heart of this study. However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A detailed description of the methodology (which is critical for other researchers to replicate the the analyses) was missing from the Methods section. • The description of the findings in Figure 2 need to be more clear and detailed in the Results section <p>Overall, the manuscript in its current state is unacceptable for publication.</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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Youdinghuan Chen
Department, University & Country	University of California, United States