

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_100272
Title of the Manuscript:	Synthesis of novel 3-methyl-1-(5-methyl-1,3-benzoxazol-2-yl)-1H-pyrazol-5-amine derivatives and In-Vitro evaluation of their antitumor and antibacterial activities.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Quite good (take notes)</p> <p>Quite good (take notes)</p> <p>Quite good (take notes)</p> <p>Quite good (take notes)</p> <p>Quite good (take notes)</p> <p>Quite good (take notes)</p> <p>Quite good (take notes)</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	yes	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>comments</p> <p>Enhancing the conclusion in the research paper with some results numbers.</p> <p>The aim of the research was not clear, preferably rewritten.</p> <p>The researcher did not mention the scientific sources in the work methods.</p> <p>The abbreviations used are unknown.</p> <p>A medium N.A is not used to measure the antibacterial action.</p> <p>Unify the method of referring to scientific sources.</p> <p>Correct scientific names of bacteria.</p> <p>Results overlap with work methods.</p> <p>The search is rearranged</p> <p>There are notes on the search</p>	

**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>Hussein L. Alboory</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Al-Qasim Green University, Iraq</b>