

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_110470
Title of the Manuscript:	In silico analysis and 3-D structure prediction of non-synonymous single nucleotide polymorphisms (nsSNPs) in the human MED12 gene associated with uterine leiomyomas
Type of the Article	

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)
<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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, the study is beneficial to the scientific community. The study explores the frequency, nature, and potential implications of mutations, providing valuable information on the role of MED12 in the pathobiology of uterine fibroids. Additionally, the analysis of protein stability, structural impact, and post-translational modifications adds depth to the understanding of the molecular mechanisms involved. The findings may have implications for further research, diagnosis, and potentially therapeutic strategies related to uterine fibroids.</p> <p>I felt it is not suitable as the main content is about the gene deletion it deviates the thought process of the reader with regard to the original content by reading the title. Genetic and Structural Insights into MED12 Mutations in Senegalese Women with Uterine Fibroids</p> <p>Yes, the abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the study's objectives, methods, and key findings.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, it is supposed to be</p> <p>Most of the references are outdated. Especially in cancer studies it would be good if reference from latest study or maximum 5 years backdated.</p> <p>Overall, the manuscript is good appreciating the effort of authors.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Suni Ann Thomas
Department, University & Country	Kerala University of Health Sciences, India