

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Oncology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJO_109682
Title of the Manuscript:	Screening of Good Cancer Drugs via Myelodysplastic Syndromes
Type of the Article	Review Article

### 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Myelodysplastic Syndromes is good topic for research and holds a great promising future. The presented paper is well-received and written in a simple manner but compiles the required information in a nut shell easy for new reader.</b></li> <li>2. <b>The topic is to simple, could be elaborated with better use of words.</b></li> <li>3. <b>Abstract is too long and should be made crisp and use of better words along with rearrangement of the first line.</b></li> <li>4. <b>For, Subsection 2 better descriptive heading should be used instead of (Commentary and discussion).</b></li> <li>5. <b>Manuscript is scientifically correct.</b></li> <li>6. <b>References need though upgradation as paper are also available till latest dated 2023. Most of the references are old.</b></li> </ol> <p>Subsections should be done with proper heading; article is too basic for any scientific reader more information could be added. Use and quoting of examples lie 'Joe Biden's son' case are not suggested in any scientific paper. The are suitable for magazine articles instead.</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>	English needs to be revised and extensive language editing needed.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	The article is a very basic article with no upgradation of information and quoting of latest references and it is up to the editor of journal, if they wish to publish the article.	

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Anjana Goel</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>GLA University, India</b>