

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_128452
Title of the Manuscript:	Study some immunological parameters In Iraqi patient suffering from cholecystitis in AL-Anbar province
Type of the Article	

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 holds significant value for the scientific community, offering new insights or innovative approaches that enhance current knowledge. Its findings contribute to addressing existing challenges and pave the way for future research to improve practical applications or clinical practices. This work represents a valuable addition to advancing the field.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	A suggested alternative title could be: "Assessment of Interleukins IL-12, IL-13, and MIP as Biomarkers in Acute and Chronic Cholecystitis Patients: An Observational Study" This revision provides more clarity by specifying both the biomarkers and the types of cholecystitis (acute and chronic) being studied. It also emphasizes the observational nature of the study, which can add to its scientific credibility.	

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is generally comprehensive but can be improved with the following suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Objective Clarity: Clearly state the research question or hypothesis, e.g., <i>"This study aims to evaluate the role of IL-12, IL-13, and MIP as biomarkers for cholecystitis."</i> Sample Details: Include information about participant characteristics, such as age and inclusion/exclusion criteria. Methodology: Mention the specific ELISA kits or standards used for measuring the markers. Statistical Methods: Include statistical details, such as p-values or software used, for clarity on data analysis. Implications: Briefly mention how the findings could impact clinical practice, e.g., <i>"IL-12 and IL-13 may serve as reliable biomarkers for cholecystitis severity."</i> Conclusion: Provide a focused conclusion with potential next steps or applications, e.g., <i>"Further research is needed to validate these biomarkers in diverse populations."</i> 	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears scientifically sound, but there are areas for improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Biomarker Justification: Clarify why IL-12, IL-13, and MIP were selected as biomarkers for cholecystitis, referencing relevant studies. Sample Size and Demographics: Provide details about the sample size and characteristics (e.g., age, gender) for better context. Statistical Methods: Specify the statistical tests used (e.g., t-test, ANOVA) for clarity and rigor. Correlation vs. Causality: Ensure the manuscript distinguishes between correlation and causality in the findings. Clinical Implications: Discuss how the findings can be applied in clinical practice and mention any limitations. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript are generally sufficient and relevant, but some additional recent studies could strengthen the research. I suggest adding studies such as Psaltis et al. (2024) and Spasovski et al. (2022), which offer updated insights into inflammatory cytokines in cholecystitis. These would complement the existing references and provide more current evidence to support the findings.</p>	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality is generally suitable, but minor grammatical errors and sentence structure improvements are needed for clearer scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript presents valuable information but would benefit from improved clarity in certain sections. Expanding on the methodology and implications would strengthen the overall presentation. Consistency in referencing and adherence to academic writing standards are also recommended.</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<u>Name:</u>	Omar Sadik Shalal
<u>Department, University & Country</u>	Middle Technical University, College of Health and Medical Techniques, Iraq