

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_95613
Title of the Manuscript:	Network-based toxicogenomics approach to unraveling the influence of lead and cadmium mixture on the development and progression of Hypertension (HYP)
Type of the 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.journalarrb.com/index.php/ARRB/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	yes	
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	Yes	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Yes	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	Not some ref. are used very large list and some old so it remove and ref. require in uniform form. After reviewing the manuscript it is suggested revision as illustrated:	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. The Materials & Methods need major revision and no require point wise description. 2. So many gramical mistakes in paper please correct. 3. Reference list are long old ref. remove in text cited and bibliography. 4. The Reference section should be revised as per proper uniform style and format of the Journal.	
Minor REVISION comments	Good	
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Average	

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:	Ratan Lal Solanki
Department, University & Country	MPUAT, KVK, India