

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JPRI_103783</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>In Silico Molecular Docking Study of Some Novel Chalcone Derivatives as Anticancer Agents</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>None</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>None</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is fine for the data and scientific based knowledge. However, too strong the paper, the small point of this manuscript needs to concern.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Typographical errors exist throughout the manuscript. Rectify carefully.</b></li> <li>2. <b>The conclusion needs to take only the significant point from the review and summarize with cover whole work.</b></li> <li>3. <b>The introduction section seems too much detail and it is not match of the work. Author try to re-write with the paragraph not sub-topic for making the flow information of the manuscript.</b></li> <li>4. <b>Revise the all figure and table for increasing the resolution.</b></li> <li>5. <b>The font type should be the same style in the whole manuscript (in table needs to revise it)</b></li> <li>6. <b>check the plagiarisms in the whole manuscript. The evident file is a PDF attachment herewith, please check it out.</b></li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Utthapon Issara</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Rajamangala University of Technology, Thailand</b>