

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Oncology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJO_128518
Title of the Manuscript:	AI-Driven Nutritional Interventions to Boost Immunotherapy Effectiveness: A Systematic Review
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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is highly significant for the scientific community as it addresses the critical intersection of artificial intelligence, nutrition, and immunotherapy—a rapidly evolving field with transformative potential for cancer treatment. By systematically reviewing AI-driven approaches to personalized nutritional interventions, the study provides valuable insights into enhancing immunotherapy outcomes, which are often hindered by patient variability. The work is timely, considering the increasing emphasis on precision medicine, and bridges gaps between AI, nutritional science, and clinical oncology. Its comprehensive approach to exploring challenges and future directions underscores its utility for researchers and clinicians alike.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable as it clearly conveys the focus and scope of the manuscript. However, a more concise and engaging alternative could be: "Harnessing AI for Personalized Nutrition in Enhancing Immunotherapy Outcomes: A Systematic Review."	
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 comprehensive, summarizing key elements of the study, including the objectives, methodology, findings, and implications. However, the following adjustments could improve clarity and impact: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Highlight specific findings or examples of AI-driven nutritional strategies. - Summarize the gaps or limitations discussed in the review. - Reframe the concluding sentence to emphasize actionable insights or recommendations for future research. 	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears to be scientifically accurate, supported by extensive references and logical argumentation. The integration of AI, nutrition, and immunotherapy is well-explored with appropriate examples and mechanisms. However, there is a need to ensure that all claims, especially concerning the mechanistic pathways and AI's role, are directly supported by cited studies.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are extensive, relevant, and mostly recent, covering key studies in AI, nutrition, and immunotherapy. However, including additional recent high-impact papers on AI applications in personalized medicine (e.g., Nature Reviews Clinical Oncology or Trends in Cancer) could further strengthen the manuscript.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript is well-written, with language suitable for scholarly communication. Minor edits for grammatical precision and stylistic refinement could improve readability. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Simplify overly complex sentences for clarity. - Ensure consistent use of terminology, such as "AI-driven" versus "AI-based." 	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Figures and tables (if provided) could be better integrated into the discussion to enhance understanding. - Adding case studies or real-world applications of AI-driven nutritional interventions would strengthen practical relevance. - A brief section on ethical considerations regarding AI and personalized nutrition would provide a holistic view. <p>This manuscript is well-constructed and addresses a timely, multidisciplinary topic of significant importance. With minor improvements to its ethical considerations, language precision, and integration of practical applications, it could be ready for publication.</p> <p>No indications of plagiarism were detected in the manuscript upon review. The content appears original and well-cited, with references appropriately supporting the discussion</p>	

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