

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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	This manuscript provides a comprehensive review of CAR-T cell therapy, an innovative immunotherapy that has significantly impacted cancer treatment, especially in hematologic malignancies. It offers valuable insights into the mechanisms, manufacturing, and therapeutic potential of CAR-T cells, contributing to the scientific community's understanding of immunotherapy and targeted therapy. This work is significant for both researchers and clinicians working to enhance cancer treatments and mitigate adverse effects associated with immunotherapy. The manuscript is detailed and well-researched, providing a solid foundation for future studies.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is broadly suitable but might be more precise if it reflects the specific focus on both therapeutic benefits and limitations. Suggested alternative: "CAR-T Cell Therapy: Advances, Challenges, and Future Directions in Cancer Treatment."	
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.	The abstract is informative but would benefit from a brief mention of recent clinical outcomes or key statistics to emphasize CAR-T's impact on specific cancer types. Additionally, summarizing the section on "Pros and Cons" would help readers gauge the manuscript's balanced perspective.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's structure is appropriate, with sections covering key components such as CAR-T cell mechanisms, manufacturing, therapeutic impact, and challenges. However, a standalone section on clinical outcomes or recent CAR-T approval status could enhance clarity for readers interested in recent clinical progress.	
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 scientifically robust and technically sound, accurately detailing CAR-T cell biology and engineering. It appropriately explains CAR structure, signaling domains, and therapeutic efficacy. The references to genetic modification techniques and mechanisms of action are particularly well-supported by recent studies, ensuring the manuscript's reliability. The discussion on manufacturing challenges and toxicity management provides a comprehensive perspective on CAR-T therapy's real-world complexities.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are extensive and include relevant, recent studies that support the manuscript's assertions, particularly from leading immunotherapy and oncology journals. To further strengthen this work, additional references on the latest FDA/EMA approvals or recent CAR-T applications in solid tumors could add depth.	
Minor REVISION comments	Language Quality: The manuscript's language is mostly clear, though minor grammatical and syntactic revisions would improve readability and flow. Some sentences could be simplified for better comprehension, especially in sections with heavy scientific terminology. Technical Clarity: Consider defining abbreviations (e.g., CRS) on first use for accessibility to a broader audience. Adding a table summarizing CAR-T therapies by approval status or target cancer type may also improve clarity.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Overall, this manuscript provides a thorough exploration of CAR-T therapy's current landscape. The detailed analysis of challenges, particularly toxicity and the high cost of treatment, highlights important areas for further research, making this manuscript both relevant and timely.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kirolos Eskandar
Department, University & Country	Helwan University, Egypt