

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGMB_128369
Title of the Manuscript:	Gene Editing in Cancer Immunotherapy: Mechanisms, Advancements, Limitations and Future Directions
Type of the Article	Review 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 provides a detailed exploration of the transformative role of gene editing in cancer immunotherapy, highlighting its potential to revolutionize cancer treatment paradigms. It combines comprehensive reviews of current advancements, mechanisms, and challenges in using gene-editing tools like CRISPR-Cas9, TALENs, and ZFNs for engineering immune cells. This work offers critical insights into overcoming the limitations of traditional cancer therapies and lays the groundwork for future innovations in precision medicine, making it a valuable contribution to oncology research.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Gene Editing in Cancer Immunotherapy: Mechanisms, Advancements, Limitations and Future Directions," effectively conveys the scope and focus of the article.	
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 provides a solid summary of the manuscript's scope, covering the mechanisms, advancements, limitations, and future directions. However, the language could be streamlined, and the inclusion of specific examples (e.g., clinical trials or technologies like base and prime editing) could enhance its clarity. Suggestions for Improvement: Explicitly mention pivotal technologies or innovations, such as CAR-T cells or AI integration. Briefly highlight key clinical outcomes to emphasize the practical impact.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears scientifically robust, presenting detailed discussions on gene-editing technologies and their applications in cancer immunotherapy. The inclusion of limitations and future directions ensures a balanced perspective.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and include both foundational and recent studies.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript's language is generally clear and suitable for scholarly communication. Minor grammatical errors, such as subject-verb agreement ("several tools has emerged"), and occasional awkward phrasing should be addressed for improved readability.	
Optional/General comments	Rationale: The manuscript provides a comprehensive and well-researched review of gene editing in cancer immunotherapy, demonstrating its relevance to the scientific community. The content is scientifically accurate, well-structured, and sufficiently supported by recent references. However, minor revisions are needed to enhance language clarity, address grammatical errors, and refine the abstract for improved readability and impact. These issues do not detract from the manuscript's overall quality, making it suitable for publication after minor revisions.	

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:	Edenilson Brandl
Department, University & Country	Brazil