

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	Disease and Health Research: New Insights
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2475
Title of the Manuscript:	Tumor Associated Macrophages: A Review with Institutional Study
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript describes the association of macrophages with Oral Squamous Cell Carcinoma. It also describes its significance with metastasis, recurrence and survival. It is a review article.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	In the title, the significance of these tumor associated macrophages can be mentioned. Then it will be clear to the readers from the title the subject matter of the manuscript. The title can be "The Tumor associated Macrophages and its significance with the tumor behaviour : a Review " or " Tumor associated Macrophages and their contribution to the Prognosis of the tumor : a Review" or something like this.	
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 is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is organized. The subsections are clearly written. Addition of photomicrograph of the Tumor associated macrophages will make it more interesting.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. Methodology has been described. Statistical analysis has been done. Only IHC has not been used .	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references are adequate and recent. Addition of references with IHC may be done.	

[Review Form2](#)

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and decription are appropriate. Use of simple sentences instead of complex sentences will be helpful. In the observation paragraph the word Comparison spelling should be corrected. In the objective part the references have not been used serially. After 8 ; 14 has come . In previous part also 9-13 not used.	
Optional/General comments	The study is good and clinically relevant.	

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:	Madhumita Mukhopadhyay
Department, University & Country	JISMSR, India