

Journal Name:	Journal of Medicine and Health Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOMHR_12276
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of smoking on transcriptomics of primary oral cavity tumor studied using publicly available (GSE) single-cell RNA seq dataset
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:

<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>

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>
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>I have not understood what type of study it is</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article is not suitable Not mentioned 1.What type of study is it. 2 on whom the study was conducted?</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>Abstract should be structured should follow background, methods, results and conclusion. Background of the study or need for the study is missing,</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The methodology is not clear like type of study sources of data, methods of data collection, and statistical test applied, in discussion present study should be compared with other similar studies</p>	
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum</p>	<p>Methodology of the should be written properly In introduction aims and objectives of the study not mentioned Methodology inappropriate, ethical approval taken?</p>	

3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Yes sufficient	
Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	ok	
Optional/General comments	Methodology and discussion should be written clearly	

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:	Jyoti Byakodi
Department, University & Country	MUHS, India