

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_127015
Title of the Manuscript:	CAR-T Cell Therapy: Hope and Healing in the Battle Against Cancer
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It will be more beneficial to have the updated information in the research field. publishing the articles will add up value to the knowledge and profile.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes it's fine	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	It's quite good but some grammatical corrections are required to make it more presentable. If 1 or 2 concluded points are added it will give proper clarification	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	It's appropriate but minor correction is required in structure. If basic structure is provided it will give proper idea to readers.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is almost good but few minor corrections are required to make it more presentable and scientifically good. The changes like instead of adding the graphical presentation or figures in last it has to be added just below the the information where it is explained	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are enough but it has to be mentioned in numbers as hyperlink near the points instead of adding it as a author name in bracket.	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Only 4-5 changes are required which i have mentioned above.	

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:	Fatima Khatoon
Department, University & Country	Nizam Institute of Pharmacy, India