

Review form for the paper submitted to *Advances in Clinical and Experimental Medicine*

Recommendation:

- reject
 - minor revision needed
 - reconsider after major revision (re-review obligatory)
 - accept without changes
-
- Overall manuscript rating (0–100)
 - Below 1 – the lowest score, 5- the highest score
 - Priority for publication (1–5)
 - Novelty (1–5)
 - Abstract (Does it clearly and accurately describe the content of the paper?) (1–5)
 - Introduction (Is the background of the study made clear and helpful to readers unfamiliar with the topic?) (1–5)
 - Aim (Is the aim of the study adequately formulated?) (1–5)
 - Methodology (Are the methods appropriate and described comprehensively?) (1–5)
 - Statistical analysis (1–5)
 - Presentation (Is the message clearly presented? Are figures and tables well designed and informative?) (1–5)
 - Interpretations and conclusions (Are they justified by the results?) (1–5)
 - Reference (Is it adequate to other work in the field and mainly from last 5 years?) (1–5)
 - Language (1–5)
 - Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state “none” if this is not applicable)

Confidential information for Editors (not visible for authors)

Comments for Authors (These remarks should not include your name or any indication of your judgment as to the manuscript's acceptability for publication. Please include specific comments on each section of the manuscript, including the Title, Abstract/Summary, Introduction, Purpose of the study, Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusions and References. If possible, submit your remarks in the following order: (1) General comments; (2) Specific recommendations for revision: (a) major, (b) minor).

Comment on the graphical abstract (visible to authors) – it should state whether the graphical abstract (if it has been provided) is acceptable, and if not, what should be corrected. If there is no graphical abstract provided, simply ignore this element.