

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	<a href="#">Achievements and Challenges of Medicine and Medical Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3204
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the Cytological Changes of the Oral Mucosa Among Smokers in Al Madinah Al Munawara Using Argyrophilic Nucleolar Organizer Region (AgNOR) Counts and Papanicolaus Stain
Type of the Article	Book chapter

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>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.</b>	<p>The research demonstrates a well-organised methodology and effectively tackles an important public health concern. The application of AgNOR counts as an indicator of cellular proliferation is a notable advantage, especially regarding smoking-related pathology.</p> <p>The inclusion of 500 participants enhances the findings and facilitates a more thorough analysis of cytological changes between smokers and nonsmokers.</p> <p>The integration of AgNOR and Pap staining provides a comprehensive method for evaluating cytological alterations, potentially enhancing diagnostic precision.</p>	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	A title should be the fewest possible words that accurately describe the content of the paper. <b>Cytological evaluation of the oral mucosa in smokers utilising argyrophilic nucleolar organiser region and Papanicolaou stain analysis in Al Madinah Al Munawara.</b>	
<b>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.</b>	<b>YES</b>	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	<b>YES</b>	
<b>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.</b>	<p>One of the key strengths of the study is the comprehensive sample size, which includes 500 participants. This robust sample allows for a more detailed analysis of cytological changes between smokers and nonsmokers, enhancing the reliability of the findings. Additionally, the use of multiple diagnostic techniques, specifically the combination of AgNOR and Pap staining, presents a dual approach that could improve diagnostic accuracy.</p> <p>The statistical analysis conducted using SPSS also adds credibility to the results, with clear reporting of p-values. Furthermore, the ethical considerations are well addressed, as the study received appropriate ethical approval, ensuring adherence to standards in research involving human subjects.</p>	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	<b>YES</b>	

**Review Form2**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b>comments</p>	<p>Areas for improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The criteria for including smokers and nonsmokers could be elaborated upon further. For example, detailing the number of years participants have been smoking would improve the comprehension of the population's smoking history.</li> <li>2. Providing clarification on how the researchers managed confounding factors, including diet or oral hygiene practices, would enhance the validity of the results.</li> <li>3. The authors acknowledge a limitation concerning sample size; however, it is essential to also consider potential biases in participant selection and the limitations inherent in the diagnostic methods employed. Addressing the potential for interobserver variability in cytological assessments would enhance the understanding of the study's limitations.</li> <li>4. The clarity of the presentation of results, especially in tables and figures, could be enhanced. It is essential to clearly label all data points and ensure that the figures are properly referenced within the text.</li> </ol> <p>This research offers significant insights into the cytological alterations in the oral mucosa linked to smoking. The methodology and findings are robust; however, addressing the identified areas for improvement will further enhance the paper's rigour and impact. I suggest implementing minor revisions prior to publication.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> (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>
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Sajda Khan Gajdhar</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Ibn Sina National College for Medical Studies, Saudi Arabia</b></p>