

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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 study is useful because it compares the human gene network with commonly used model organisms (like mice and fruit flies) in aging research. This kind of comparison could help researchers make better choices when picking models to study specific aspects of aging. I think this adds real value for scientists interested in aging and gerontology.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is okay but could be clearer. I'd suggest something like: "Comparative Analysis of Gene Networks in Humans and Model Organisms for Aging Research."	
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.	The abstract covers the main points but could be more direct about why these findings matter. Maybe add a quick note on how the network findings (like density and connectivity) influence choosing model organisms for aging research.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure and layout make sense, with a logical order from introduction to results and conclusion.	
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.	Adding a bit more explanation on why certain network parameters were chosen and what they mean in the context of aging would improve understanding	
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?	A light edit for grammar and flow would make it easier to read.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bozorgmehr Norouzi
Department, University & Country	Erasmus Medical Centre, Netherlands