

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_113327
Title of the Manuscript:	INSILICO TOXICITY AND PHARMACOKINETICS TESTS TO GET CANDIDATES FOR ANTITUMOR DRUG
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The concept work and the idea of the manuscript is acceptable for scientific community. But it needs major modification to address the issues. The authors used "Sorafenib" as reference or standard to compare the results of his/her find with them. For that the author should be first define the physicochemical properties of Sorafenib introduction.</p> <p>2. No. the title of the article is not suitable. INSILICO TOXICITY AND PHARMACOKINETICS TESTS TO GET CANDIDATES FOR ANTITUMOR DRUG. But no any results show the kinetics test described in manuscript. I suggest "Insilco Toxicity and Pharmaceutical properties to get candidates for Antitumor Drug."</p> <p>3. the abstract not connected, the first statement not have relation with the last statement. Totally not has coherence or flow ideas appropriately. So, the author should be rewriting again the abstract of the article comprehensively.</p> <p>4. it's okay</p> <p>5. very weak. The manuscript should be rewritten again by including scientific evidence and supporting literatures.</p> <p>7. Lack of references. Authors should be cited all the reference used in the introduction section appropriately. Examples 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th paragraph totally lack of references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Authors should be re-modifying again to be suitable for scholars.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dirersa, Worku Batu
Department, University & Country	Ambo University, Ethiopia