

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	

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>

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>
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.	This manuscript addresses a vital area in oncology: the use of combination therapies to support immunotherapy for tumor diseases. By focusing on how various methods—such as lymphodepletion, chemoimmunotherapy, immune checkpoint inhibition, and precision medicine—enhance immunotherapy, it offers a comprehensive overview of potential pathways to improve cancer treatment efficacy. The review of 30-40 years of research strengthens its credibility and relevance, presenting an essential discussion for both clinicians and researchers on the current and future potential of integrated cancer therapies. This manuscript is valuable for guiding new clinical studies and offering insights into the application of personalized medicine in oncology.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title could be more precise. A suggested alternative title is: "Optimizing Cancer Immunotherapy through Combination Therapies: Advances in Chemoimmunotherapy, Lymphodepletion, and Precision Medicine."	
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 could benefit from clarifying the specific advancements of each method (LD, CI, ICI, and PM) within combination therapy. Summarizing the impact of each therapy on treatment outcomes would improve clarity. Additionally, removing terms like "confused phenomenon" and instead providing concise descriptions of the challenges encountered would strengthen readability	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure is generally appropriate, with clear sections for each type of combination therapy, including lymphodepletion, chemoimmunotherapy, immune checkpoint inhibition, and precision medicine. The organization supports a logical progression from historical development to current applications, enhancing reader comprehension of complex multi-modal therapies.	
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 robust, with detailed descriptions of various combination therapies based on a significant body of research. By citing pivotal studies and presenting recent advancements in the field, the authors demonstrate a thorough understanding of the complex interactions involved in combination therapies. The use of historical and clinical data to support claims reinforces the manuscript's technical soundness, making it both informative and credible. Moreover, the attention to precision medicine, genomics, and advanced techniques, such as CAR-T and TIL therapies, aligns well with current scientific trends and the personalized treatment approach.	

Review Form 3

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are extensive, covering both foundational studies and recent developments up to 2024, which is commendable. However, adding references related to the latest advancements in gene-editing applications within immunotherapy (e.g., CRISPR-Cas9) and artificial intelligence in treatment optimization could further enhance the depth and modernity of the bibliography.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language Quality: The language is mostly suitable for scholarly communication, but some phrases, such as "confused phenomenon," could be rephrased for clarity. Improving transitions between sections and refining complex sentences would enhance readability. Terminology and Clarity: Terms like "ACT efficacy" could be clarified (e.g., specifying "efficacy of adoptive cell transfer" on first mention) to ensure accessibility for readers outside this specialized field.	
Optional/General comments	Including a graphical abstract could help summarize the complex information for a broader audience. Also, an expanded discussion on the clinical challenges associated with implementing combination therapies would be beneficial, especially in terms of regulatory hurdles and cost implications. This could provide additional insight into the practicality of translating these therapies from research to clinical practice. Based on the quality of the review, relevance to the field, and the minor improvements suggested, I would recommend a score of 8.5/10. This places the manuscript in the "Minor Revision" category. With some minor adjustments in phrasing, title clarification, and a clear competing interest statement, the manuscript would be suitable for publication.	

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:	Kirolos Eskandar
Department, University & Country	Helwan University, Egypt