

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Oncology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJO_91603
Title of the Manuscript:	The binding property of pregelatinized cocoyam starch on paracetamol tablets.
Type of the Article	Minireview 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.journalirjo.com/index.php/IRJO/editorial-policy>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Title of the manuscript is totally different from its content.2. In 3.0 Mechanism of action, it is not very clear. First of all, dostarlimab is not described in this section. Second, Programmed Cell Death 1 is abbreviated as PD1 in the first paragraph, but in the latter paragraph, it seems to be abbreviated as PD-1. Third, in the latter paragraph, it is not clear what kind of cells are mentioned in the part. Please re-construct this section.3. In 4.0 Pharmacokinetics, I think that administration dose and route should appear first.4. In 6.0 Adverse effects of dostarlimab, incidence of side effects should be indicated, not "More Common, Less Common, and Rare".5. In 8.0 Uses in special populations, at first, I thought care should be taken before dostarlimab administration as to whether women patients are pregnant or not. However, in the latter part, it appeared: If pregnancy develops, the doctor should be called right away. Then, breastfeeding follows, and described just briefly. Furthermore, there is an additional section, 8.2. Lactation. I would like the authors to brush up these sections.6. In 9.0 Toxicity, I do not think it is necessary to repeat adverse effects here. I think the first 3 short paragraphs regarding to adverse effects may be deleted.7. Please draw some conclusions by making a "Conclusions" section.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Shogo Ozawa
Department, University & Country	Iwate Medical University, Japan