



Abbas Burhan Salihi <abbas.salihi@su.edu.krd>

Frontiers: Thank you for submitting your Independent Review Report! - 763338

Frontiers Molecular Biosciences <molecularbiosciences.editorial.office@frontiersin.org> Tue, Sep 21, 2021 at 11:01 PM
Reply-To: Frontiers Molecular Biosciences <molecularbiosciences.editorial.office@frontiersin.org>
To: abbas.salihi@su.edu.krd

Dear Dr Salihi,

Frontiers Molecular Biosciences has sent you a message. Please click 'Reply' to send a direct response

Thank you for submitting your independent review report for the manuscript "A review on the role of miR-1290 in the carcinogenesis". The handling editor has been notified, and you can find a copy of your report below.

You will be informed once the interactive review process is activated, to allow direct discussion with the authors. Until this next stage, you can still modify your report if you have any outstanding comments.

You can access your report and the manuscript online using the following link:

<http://www.frontiersin.org/Review/EnterReviewForum.aspx?activationno=94e128b6-3952-498b-807b-0352cad2c725&retab=1>

To familiarize yourself further with the Frontiers review guidelines:

http://www.frontiersin.org/Journal/ReviewGuidelines.aspx?s=1474&name=protein_and_rna_networks

Best regards,

Your Frontiers in Molecular Biosciences team

Frontiers | Editorial Office - Collaborative Peer Review Team

www.frontiersin.org

Avenue du Tribunal Fédéral 34

Lausanne, Switzerland

Office T 41 21 510 1789

For technical issues, please contact our IT Helpdesk (support@frontiersin.org)

Manuscript title: A review on the role of miR-1290 in the carcinogenesis

Manuscript ID: 763338

Authors: Soudeh Ghafouri-Fard, Tayyebeh Khoshbakht, Mohammad Taheri, Mohammad Samadian

Journal: Frontiers in Molecular Biosciences, section Protein and RNA Networks

Article type: Review

Submitted on: 23 Aug 2021

Edited by: Qinan Yin

Research Topic: Tumorigenesis Regulated by miRNAs

Independent Review Report, Reviewer: Abbas Salihi

EVALUATION

Please list your revision requests for the authors and provide your detailed comments, including highlighting limitations and strengths of the review. If you have additional comments based on Q2 and Q3 you can add them as well.

I appreciate the efforts of the authors in writing this valuable review, but I have the following comments:

1. Keyword: the list of keywords is not run with the content and the title of the review.
2. Title: Instead of using carcinogenesis, I think it's better to describe a specific cancer mechanism in the title.
3. Abstract: Very well organized, but I prefer to change "in the present manuscript" to "in the present review".
4. Introduction: The introduction is relatively brief and does not address the extent of the article; also, the review's goal is

unclear.

5. Cell line studies, Animal studies and Clinical studies: I suggest changing these subtitles.

6. Table 3. Please change this title to "Dysregulation of miR-1290 in clinical specimens".

7. The abstract and the opening of the discussion both repeated this section of the paragraph: " This miRNA has interactions with SOCS4, GSK3, BCL2, CCNG2, KIF13B, INPP4B, hMSH2, KIF13B, NKD1, FOXA1, IGFBP3, CCAT1, FOXA1, NAT1, SMEK1, SCAI, ZNF667-AS1, ABLIM1, Circ_0000629 and CDC73."

8. Discussion: There is no link between the paragraphs of this section

9. References: Well-organized, with the exception of reference number 16, which requires revision.

The review's main concept is excellent, but I would recommend categorizing the manuscript's body according to cancer types rather than cell lines, animals, or clinical studies.

Check List

a. Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes

b. Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

Yes

c. Does this manuscript refer only to published data? (unpublished or original data is not allowed for this article type)

Yes

d. Does the review include a balanced, comprehensive, and critical view of the research area?

Yes

QUALITY ASSESSMENT:

Rigor

4

Quality of the writing

4

Overall quality of the content

3

Interest to a general audience

3
