

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Immunology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJI_126682
Title of the Manuscript:	How Combination Therapy Supporting Immunotherapy for Tumor Disease
Type of the Article	Review

**General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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>

Review Form 3

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 minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript provides valuable insights into the evolving field of chemoimmunotherapy and its potential to enhance cancer treatment. By integrating decades of research, the work addresses the challenges of combining chemotherapy and immunotherapy effectively, offering a well-rounded approach for future advancements. The focus on precision medicine and immunotherapy is timely and could lead to better outcomes in cancer therapeutics.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title is informative but could be more precise. I suggest: <i>Advancing Cancer Treatment Through Combination Chemoimmunotherapy: Four Decades of Research and Future Directions.</i>	
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 but somewhat dense. It could benefit from clearer sectioning to emphasize key points. Consider simplifying or summarizing the historical background and focusing more on the combination therapy. Additionally, highlighting specific findings from the research would make the abstract more engaging.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and overall structure are appropriate, presenting information in a logical sequence. Nonetheless, some paragraphs could be refined to ensure they are succinct and avoid repetition.	
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 appears scientifically sound, grounded in robust research, and the claims are well-supported by data and references. The integration of precision medicine and immune cell culture techniques is compelling. The work successfully conveys advancements in combination therapies and the rationale behind them	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are recent and adequately support the manuscript's claims. However, including some highly cited recent papers on the latest advancements in chemoimmunotherapy and precision medicine could enhance the reference list. I suggest considering references that explore newer checkpoint inhibitors or combination strategies.	
Minor REVISION comments	Language/English Quality: The language is generally appropriate, but some sentences can be restructured for clarity and fluency.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Language editing require Add more data releted to scintific and clinical content.  I find this manuscript highly informative and relevant, as it consolidates significant research efforts into a coherent narrative. The historical perspective combined with recent innovations adds depth. However, some sections could be streamlined for clarity, and additional visual aids might improve understanding.	

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:	Anjali Sharma
Department, University & Country	Guru Gobind Singh College of Pharmacy, India