

Review Form2

Book Name:	Research Perspectives of Microbiology and Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2865
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring the Potential of Human Papilloma Virus: An Overview
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I appreciate the manuscript's depth in covering both the epidemiology and molecular biology of HPV, highlighting the importance of vaccination programs. However, I believe that certain sections could benefit from clearer explanations and updated data to further enhance its contribution to the field.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is clear and provides a good indication of the topic discussed. However, the phrase "Potential of Human Papilloma Virus" is somewhat vague. It might be better to specify whether the focus is on the epidemiology, prevention, treatment, or general impact of HPV. For example, a more specific title could be "Exploring the Epidemiology and Prevention of Human Papillomavirus: An Overview."	
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 good overview, but it could be more concise. There is a lot of detailed information, such as specific percentages and statistics, which may overwhelm the reader before they delve into the chapter. Consider simplifying the abstract to focus on the main themes. Author needs to check the exact number up to 2024 data. The language could be refined to improve clarity. For example, "the fourth deadliest malignancy in women—having been diagnosed" might be smoother as "the fourth deadliest malignancy in women."	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The overall structure of the manuscript is appropriate.	
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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness by presenting well-researched and up-to-date information on Human Papilloma Virus (HPV). It draws on a wide range of credible sources to support its claims, particularly in the areas of HPV epidemiology, molecular biology, and its link to various cancers. The inclusion of detailed descriptions of HPV strains, transmission mechanisms, and prevention strategies, such as vaccination, reinforces its scientific accuracy. However, some sections could benefit from more recent data and a deeper exploration of emerging treatments to further validate the manuscript's technical thoroughness.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	A significant portion of the references are outdated, with many sources dating back to the early 2000s and some even older (e.g., 2006, 2010). Given the rapid advancements in medical research, especially with the introduction of new vaccines, diagnostic methods, and treatment options, it is crucial to include references from recent years (ideally within the last 5-7 years).	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	When using technical or specialized vocabulary, it is essential to provide clarification or context so that readers unfamiliar with the term can easily understand it. For example, instead of just saying "prevalent," you could explain it as "widely occurring" or "common within a certain population."	
Optional/General comments	The authors should provide more emphasis on the correlation between high-risk HPV strains and cancers outside the genital tract, with further discussion on HPV-negative cancers. The detection methods listed are comprehensive, but there should be more clarity on which methods are most commonly used in clinical settings versus research environments. A table format might work well for summarizing these techniques.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Naeem Kiani
Department, University & Country	School of Medicine Shenzhen University, Shenzhen University, China