

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	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 holds significant importance for the scientific community as it provides valuable insights into the future treatment strategies for glioblastoma, one of the most aggressive and challenging brain cancers. By exploring novel therapeutic approaches or identifying key molecular targets, the study lays the groundwork for developing more effective treatments, potentially improving patient outcomes. Furthermore, the article contributes to a deeper understanding of the underlying mechanisms of glioblastoma, which is crucial for overcoming current limitations in therapy. Its findings could guide the design of clinical trials and inform future research aimed at combating this devastating disease.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title should be clearer. May be it could be like this: Unlocking New Treatment Avenues in Glioblastoma: The Role of Checkpoint Inhibition"	
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 article is comprehensive in its exploration of checkpoint inhibition as a promising therapeutic strategy for glioblastoma.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically accurate, presenting well-supported data and evidence that align with current research on checkpoint inhibition in glioblastoma treatment.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes references are almost recent and sufficient.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language used in the manuscript is suitable for scholarly understanding, with clear, precise terminology and a formal tone appropriate for an academic audience.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Prih Bashir
Department, University & Country	Jinnah Postgraduate Medical Centre, Pakistan