

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JPRI_111888</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Alpelisib Efficacy in Advanced Breast Cancer</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

## Review Form 1.7

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>YES, but not as written here</b></p> <p>2. <b>YES</b></p> <p>3. <b>Partialy</b></p> <p>4. <b>YES, the work is well structured, but there is almost no text within each subsection. Each subsection is written too sparsely for this paper to be considered a review article</b></p> <p>5. <b>NO, This article is more like a generic leaflet for the drug alpelisib aimed more at patients than at the scientific community.</b></p> <p>6. <b>NO</b></p> <p><b>Dear authors,</b> <b>I have the impression that you wrote the paper in a hurry or you do not have enough experience. The work definitely lacks content, and it needs to be rewritten.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>In my opinion, this article requires a major revision. This article is more like a leaflet for the drug alpelisib which is aimed more at patients than at the scientific community. Authors should make a better effort and write a review paper if they want their work to be published. The paper has a good concept, however, within each sub-chapter there is almost no text at all. For example Chapter 3. Mechanism of action: There are literally 2 sentences.</p> <p>However, the paper is well structured, but the authors must make an effort and write the paper in an adequate way. In the used literature, they have an example of what a review paper should look like (Vasan N, Toska E, Scaltriti M. Overview of the relevance of PI3K pathway in HR-positive breast cancer. Ann Oncol. 2019;30(10):x3-x11). Be sure to use slightly newer literature. In the case of an adequately written paper that needs to be reviewed again, consideration of publication comes into play.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**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:	<b>Snjezana Ramic</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Hospital for Tumors, UHC Sestre, Croatia</b>