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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Title paper is well structured. Here my comments: At introduction section, the authors should highlights the issue and the objectives of the minireview. The authors sustained that the aim of the study is also, the utility of IL 6 as biomarker but at results and discussion sections they did not assessed this issue. Moreover, some conclusions are not relevant, they sustained that the results/discussion of the papers.... clears the criterion of acceptance and can be considered as potential biomarker for the diagnosis.... but they did not assessed this issue in the paper. From my point of view the authors should add some results/studies regarding the role of the IL 6 as biomarkers in the diagnosis of gliomas or they should reconsider this statement.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
In the minireview, the authors discussed the role of circulatory IL-6 in the development and progression of glioma. A total of five studies have been included for the full evaluation, the results show a significantly higher level of IL-6 in glioma cases, and IL-6 can be considered as potential biomarker for the diagnosis. Comments: 1. The section of ‘Search strategies’ is not clear and the element of ‘inclusion criteria’ is lack, the authors should complete these contents and make the results more repeatable. 2. Some grammar mistakes can also be found in this article, the authors should check this manuscript carefully.