Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_126136**
Title of the Manuscript:	**A GERANTOLOGY STUDY ON THE COMPARISON OF THE HUMAN GENE NETWORK WITH THE TRADITIONAL MODEL ORGANISMS OF AGING PROCESS**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is highly significant for the scientific community as it contributes to the fundamental understanding of aging by examining genetic and molecular mechanisms in model organisms compared to humans. It provides a quantitative analysis of network properties such as density, centrality, and clustering coefficient, which are essential for identifying similarities and differences between model organisms and human genomes. The study's detailed computational approach using Jepetto software adds valuable insights into the suitability of *Drosophila melanogaster* and *Mus musculus* as models for aging research, informing future research directions in the development of anti-aging therapies. This work is particularly interesting as it bridges computational biology with aging research, although the complexity of network analysis might benefit from further biological validation for practical application.	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	**Yes**	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	**Yes**	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	**Yes**	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript demonstrates scientific rigor and technical soundness by using an in-depth comparative approach to analyze model organisms and their relevance to human aging studies. The employment of Jepetto software for gene interaction network analysis enables a precise, quantitative comparison across genomes, focusing on key network parameters such as density, centrality nodes, and clustering coefficients. These metrics offer a scientifically robust way to assess the adequacy of Drosophila and mouse models in aging research, supporting the validity of the analysis. Additionally, the findings regarding neighborhood connectivity, centrality distribution, and network clustering coefficients highlight structural differences between human and model organism genomes, providing valuable insights that reinforce the manuscript's scientific merit.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. **-**	**Yes**	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	No	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

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:	**Arvind Kumar Shukla**
Department, University & Country	**School of Biomedical Convergence Engineering, Pusan Natinal University, South Korea**