Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Immunology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJI_126682**
Title of the Manuscript:	**How Combination Therapy Supporting Immunotherapy for Tumor Disease**
Type of the Article	**Review Article**

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.	Given the adverse effects of chemotherapy and immunotherapy on patients, the potential of immunotherapy to alleviate these side effects when used in combination with chemotherapy underscores its clinical value. Recent studies support the hypothesis that the combination of immunotherapy and chemotherapy can increase therapeutic efficacy. Therefore, an evaluation and substantiation of this combination approach based on the current literature is essential and valuable.	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	The title is quite suitable and understandable.	
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 of the article is written in a very comprehensive and understandable. However, the purpose and objectives of the review should be added to the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The sub-sections and structure of the article are also very suitable for the flow of the article.	
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 accuracy of the article is substantiated by references. I believe that the review should be developed from past to present by considering both existing and new data on this topic so that new approaches to immunotherapy and chemotherapy can be explored. Moreover, studies can be conducted based on these data. Therefore, I think the article could be scientifically correct.	
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 current.	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The language is clear and easy to understand, which makes it very suitable for scientific communication.	
Optional/General comments	References for the figures and tables should be specified. An explanation for Figure 4 is not provided under the figure legend and should be edited. The full name for CTX should be mentioned in the third line of the introduction. A section similar to a figure legend should be created for the tables, in which detailed information about the tables is given. There are no conflicts of interest associated with this manuscript. This manuscript does not contain any ethical issues.	

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:	**Ilayda ALCITEPE**
Department, University & Country	**Ege University Faculty of Medicine, Turkey**