

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_77741
Title of the Manuscript:	Quantitative assessment of serum magnesium levels in head and neck cancer: A tertiary hospital based case control study.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Paper is very much interesting – if written in different form, only minor revision required. Because a lot of mistakes, missing data I strongly advice against its publication</p> <p>Highlight the aim of study + describe its limitations, and stornng/weak points I recommend avoid writing he/we/us, use: Authors.</p> <p>Study group also poorly described. No TNM variations, no description of the cancer side- and does it affect the study; no data on age/gender/ alcohol-tobaco or others potential HNSCC etiology factors – poorly written The same procedure was done on 50 age and gender matched healthy controls = what about their age, gender, status ? do they take intraoral daily magnesium supplements? Results are poor – no age/gender/TNM relations Was orohypo pharyngs associated with p16+/p16- staining in regarding to HPV, or perhaps other factors might impact on HNSCC cancer and magnesium levels? Study data lacking on important informations; age, gender, male/female ratio, and other</p> <p>Example statement : Thus, the current study was pertinent as it not only enabled the comparison of serum magnesium levels in cancer patients vis a vis controls but also the magnesium levels in various stages of cancer. – poorly written</p> <p>Authrs state that : Hypomagnesemia in cancer are also ascribed to reduced oral intake, intracellular shift of magnesium, gastrointestinal and renal losses → but no explanation in article, if study/control goup had any additional oral intake of magnesium/supplement, or perhas had any illness as mentioned above.</p> <p>Conclusions – not suitable</p>	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kamil Nelke
Department, University & Country	Poland