

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Medicine and Health |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJMAH_127662 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Breaking Barriers in Glioblastoma: Checkpoint Inhibition as a Therapeutic Frontier |
| 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>

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 critical challenges in the treatment of glioblastoma (GBM), the most aggressive and common malignant brain tumor in adults. By providing a comprehensive review of immune checkpoint inhibitors (ICIs), the manuscript highlights their potential to revolutionize GBM therapy through immune system modulation. It critically examines both the successes and limitations of ICIs, offering valuable insights into their efficacy when used in combination with other therapies. Furthermore, the discussion on biomarkers and personalized treatment strategies underscores the need for innovative approaches to overcome GBM's resistance to immunotherapy, making this review a vital resource for advancing research and clinical practices in oncology. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | The title " <i>Breaking Barriers in Glioblastoma: Checkpoint Inhibition as a Therapeutic Frontier</i> " is engaging and conveys the innovative focus of the article. It effectively captures the dual themes of overcoming challenges in glioblastoma treatment (e.g., the blood-brain barrier and immunosuppressive tumor environment) and exploring immune checkpoint inhibitors (ICIs) as a promising therapeutic approach. However, if a more precise and formal title is desired, an alternative could be: "Advancing Glioblastoma Treatment: Challenges and Opportunities of Immune Checkpoint Inhibition" This alternative emphasizes the balance between the hurdles and the potential of ICIs while maintaining a professional tone. | |

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 comprehensive and well-structured, effectively summarizing the key points of the article. It provides a clear overview of the topic, highlights the challenges, and outlines the scope of the review. However, a few adjustments could make it even more impactful and precise: Suggested Additions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quantitative Context: Include specific data or statistics about GBM's prevalence or survival rates to emphasize the severity of the disease. For example: "Glioblastoma, which accounts for 48% of all primary malignant brain tumors, has a median survival of only 15 months." 2. Focus on Emerging Strategies: Briefly mention specific examples of promising combination therapies or innovative approaches (e.g., specific types of vaccines or gene therapies) to provide more detail about future directions. 3. Mention of Biomarkers: Expand slightly on the importance of biomarkers, possibly mentioning how they could guide patient selection for ICIs or combination therapies. <p>Suggested Deletions:</p> <p>The abstract does not contain redundant information, but simplifying certain sentences could improve readability without losing depth. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replace "ICIs, such as PD-1, PD-L1, and CTLA-4 inhibitors, work by reactivating T cells that are suppressed in the tumor's microenvironment" with "ICIs reactivating suppressed T cells, including PD-1, PD-L1, and CTLA-4 inhibitors." | |
| <p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p> | <p>The manuscript is scientifically accurate. However, it could benefit from additional quantitative data on survival rates and the prevalence of GBM, as well as more detailed examples of promising combination therapies. Including recent clinical trial outcomes would further strengthen its scientific rigor.</p> | |
| <p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> | <p>The sufficiency and recency of the references depend on their alignment with the manuscript's focus on glioblastoma (GBM) and immune checkpoint inhibitors (ICIs). Yes, these are sufficient.</p> | |
| <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication, with a clear and professional tone that effectively conveys complex scientific concepts. However, minor improvements in sentence structure and word choice could enhance clarity and readability. For example, simplifying overly long sentences and ensuring consistent use of technical terms would make the content more accessible. Additionally, careful proofreading for grammar and punctuation errors would further polish the manuscript for publication.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | | |

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) |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p> | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| <p>Name:</p> | <p>Ayesha Agrawal</p> |
| <p>Department, University & Country</p> | <p>Mody University, India</p> |