

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_117331
Title of the Manuscript:	Identification of the Interleukin-6 Polymorphism (-174) in the Saliva of Hemodialysis Patients
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Importance for the Scientific Community: The manuscript is indeed important for the scientific community. It provides valuable insights into a prevalent health issue and also introduces saliva as a potential diagnostic tool, which could have significant implications for non-invasive testing methods in the future. 2. Title Suitability: The title of the article is suitable as it accurately represents the content of the study. It clearly states the main focus of the research, which is the identification of a specific polymorphism in a particular patient group. 3. Abstract Comprehensiveness: The abstract is comprehensive and provides a good summary of the study. It includes the background, aims, methodology, results, and conclusion of the study. However, it could be improved by discussing the implications of the findings in the conclusion section of the abstract. 4. Subsections and Structure Appropriateness: The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and follow the standard format of scientific papers. The manuscript is logically organized into sections such as Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, and Discussion, which makes it easy to follow and understand. 5. Scientific Correctness: Based on the information provided, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. The methods used are well-established, the results are clearly presented, and the discussion provides a good interpretation of the findings. 6. References Sufficiency and Recency: The references are sufficient and recent, covering a range of relevant studies in the field. They provide a good background for the study and support the statements made in the manuscript. However, it might be beneficial to include some more recent studies on the use of saliva as a diagnostic tool in CKD, if available. This would help to further contextualize the study's findings within the current state of the field. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes. The manuscript is well-written with clear and concise sentences. The use of scientific terminology is appropriate and consistent. The grammar, punctuation, and spelling appear to be correct. The style of writing is formal and fits the academic context.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The abstract could discuss the implications of the findings in the conclusion section. The methodology section in the abstract could briefly mention the statistical methods used for data analysis. The manuscript could benefit from a thorough proofreading to ensure clarity and coherence throughout.</p>	

PART 2:

Review Form 1.7

	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:	Kimia Ghaedi
Department, University & Country	Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, Iran