

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_124701
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Immunohistochemical Expression of Isocitrate Dehydrogenase (IDH), Alpha Thalassemia/Mental Retardation Syndrome X-Linked (ATRX) and Ki-67 in the Diagnosis and Classification of CNS Gliomas
Type of the Article	

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.	Very precise and well explained manuscript, All subheadings were clear, The result is also well written and explained however the rational of study should be further elaborated.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, Because on first look it seems we are studying about something like alpha thalesemia or some syndromes, so title either should not have full abbreviation of ATRX or ADH.	
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.	Abstract is good and to the point, only type of study is not mentioned and also place of study.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its rigorous methodology, comprehensive literature review, and clear data presentation. The authors employ well-established experimental techniques, ensuring that their results are reproducible and valid. Additionally, the statistical analyses conducted are appropriate for the study design, allowing for meaningful interpretations of the data.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references in the manuscript are generally sufficient and include a mix of foundational studies and recent publications relevant to the topic and all are within last 10year period.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and overall quality of English in the manuscript are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The writing is clear and concise, effectively conveying the research findings and arguments. However, there are some areas where improvements could enhance readability, such as refining complex sentences and medical terminologies.	
Optional/General comments	Overall Good manuscript, only few things need to be sort-out and explained which i previously explained. MISSING..it seems cross sectional study	

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Faiqa Hassan
Department, University & Country	Jinnah Sindh Medical University, Pakistan