

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_126136
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A GERANTOLOGY STUDY ON THE COMPARISON OF THE HUMAN GENE NETWORK WITH THE TRADITIONAL MODEL ORGANISMS OF AGING PROCESS</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses a fundamental aspect of aging research by comparing human gene networks with those of established model organisms, <i>Drosophila melanogaster</i> + <i>Mus musculus</i>. By utilizing network statistics to analyze genomic interactions, the study provides valuable insights into the genetic and molecular mechanisms underlying aging, which could inform future therapeutic strategies for age-related diseases.</p> <p>I can appreciate this manuscript for its innovative approach + use of advanced computational tools like Jepetto software, which enhances the understanding of complex biological interactions. However, it could benefit from clearer articulation of its objectives and implications, making the findings more accessible to a broader audience. Overall, it contributes significantly to the ongoing discourse in gerontology and genomics, highlighting the relevance of model organisms in aging research.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p><b>Strengths:</b>            Subject Matter: The title clearly indicates that the study focuses on gerontology, specifically comparing human gene networks with those of traditional model organisms used in aging research.            Keywords: It includes relevant keywords such as "gerontology," "human gene network," and "model organisms," which can aid in searchability.  <b>Weaknesses:</b>            Length and Clarity: The title is somewhat lengthy and could be more concise. A shorter title would enhance clarity and impact.            Terminology: The phrase "traditional model organisms" could be more specific. It may be beneficial to explicitly mention which organisms (e.g., <i>Drosophila</i> and <i>Mus musculus</i>) are being compared.            Focus: The term "gerontology study" might not fully capture the methodological aspect of the research. A more precise description of the study's nature (e.g., "Comparative Genomic Analysis") could improve the title.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the study on aging and the analysis of model organisms, specifically <i>Drosophila melanogaster</i> and <i>Mus musculus</i>, in relation to human genomic data. However, there are several areas where it could be enhanced:            Clarification of Objectives: The abstract could benefit from a clearer statement of the primary objectives of the study, emphasizing the significance of understanding aging through these model organisms.            Methodological Details: While the use of Jepetto software is mentioned, a brief explanation of its functionality and relevance to the analysis would provide better context for readers unfamiliar with the tool.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p><b>Appear to be ok</b></p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>Scientific correctness of this manuscript is supported by its rigorous methodology and the use of established computational tools for genomic analysis. By employing Jepetto software to conduct a comparative analysis of gene networks across species, the study adheres to sound scientific principles, allowing for a systematic exploration of genetic interactions relevant to aging.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>OK</p>	

**Review Form 3**

:		
<u>Minor REVISION</u> comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Appear to be correct	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Good work	

**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:	Kartheek R. Balapala
Department, University & Country	School of Medicine, Copper Belt University, Zambia