Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAMMR_86304**
Title of the Manuscript:	**ROLE OF PHOSPHOLIPASE A2 RECEPTOR AND NEUTROPHILS IN HUMAN CELL BIOLOGY**
Type of the Article	**Review 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://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**The review manuscript entitled "Role of phospholipase A2 receptor and neutrophils in human cell biology" is interesting from the inflammatory point of view since sPLA 2 enzymes have the capacity to generate lipids that are key signaling messengers and important regulators of inflammatory processes. and have been related to different inflammatory diseases. However, this review has different shortcomings and errors which are listed below.** **Resume** **1. In this section of the manuscript the authors do not mention the relationship between the phospholipase 2 receptor and neutrophils contained in the title of the work** **2. They define sPLA2s, but not sPLA2-BPs** **3. Which animals and which plants were compared with Glycine Max** **4. Check your conclusion.** **-Introduction** **1. What is ALI** **2. The title of figure 1 does not relate to the text of the manuscript (drug? Enzyme activity?)** **3. Figure caption: What is released into the extracellular space?** **4. What antibodies?** **5. They can improve the visual presentation of the image** **6. They could include studies carried out in the period 2015 to 2020 to update the timeline** **-Fig. two** **1. Figure 2 is not mentioned in the text of the manuscript** **2. What is the importance of comparing these seven phospholipases** **3. The authors created figure 2 as indicated with the software they used, however, they do not mention the version, manufacturer, city, etc.** **-PLA2 Secretary Structure????** **1. Importance of the PLA2 structure** **2. Pymol Software manufacturer data, city, version etc.** **-The Function of sPLA2-IIA in ALI** **1. What is ALI and ARDS?** **2. This text is not understood** **3. qRT-PCR was used to assess PLA2G2A sPLA2-IIA m-RNA levels in EVs from early, late, and non-ARDS patients. Did the authors perform these experiments? What did they find?** **-An Enzymatic Activity of PLA2** **1. QRT-PCR was used to determine sPLA2-IIA (sPLA2-IIA) mRNA levels in the BAL fluid of early, late, and non-ARDS patients. (appointment)** **2. Biorender Software manufacturer data, city, version etc.** **-sPLA2 Mutations and Weight Loss in Patients with Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD)** **1. Which cytokines are responsible for weight loss in patients?** **2. Bibliographic references?** **-Other Diseases Caused by sPLA2 Mutations** **The text lacks bibliographical references that detract from its scientific value.** **-Prospects and Conclusion** **This manuscript does not conclude what is the importance of neutrophils and phospholipases in the respiratory diseases mentioned.** **-REFERENCES** **Throughout the manuscript they allude to the references consulted up to page 3,**	

	reference 9, the following pages lack citations, although the authors report that they consulted 85 citations	
Minor REVISION comments	1. Bad writing of the English language 2. Bad spelling 3. Poor quality of figure 1 4. The title of the work is not reflected with the text	
Optional/General comments	In general, the manuscript is poorly written, they lack continuity in ideas. It gives the impression that they copy and paste and are not careful with bibliographic citations, and I also consider that the title is not the best for this manuscript.	

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:	**Sara Rojas Dotor**
Department, University & Country	**Mexican Social Security Institute, Mexico**