

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_JAMMR_117621
Title of the Manuscript:	Direct-acting antivirals' safety profile in patients with advanced liver cirrhosis who have hepatitis C: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis
Type of the Article	Review

### 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> )

### **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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is very important for scientific community since it concluded that patients with Hepatitis C with liver cirrhosis who were treated using direct acting antibodies (DAA) were found to be safe and effective with very less complications or mortality rates.</p> <p>The title of the article is suitable</p> <p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive, however I suggest you add liver cirrhosis instead of only cirrhosis</p> <p>Subsections and structure of the manuscript were appropriate</p> <p>Yes I think the manuscript is scientifically correct science the author made analysis on sixteen different studies and came up with his findings.</p> <p>References are sufficiently enough and recent with up to date references. However, I suggest you state all authors in the reference section rather using <i>et.,al</i> and also use a particular style of referencing such as APA style of referencing throughout.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language/ English quality of the article is clear, simple and suitable and for scholarly communication</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The work was well written and presented with very suitable scholarly communication. Contents were very relevant and suitable for publication. However, the Review could have been clearly stated from when to when and also I think it can also involve more than sixteen different studies to have a broader and holistic analysis.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ileimokumo E. Ogregade</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Bayelsa Medical University, Nigeria</b>