

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_116130
Title of the Manuscript:	Qualitative Analysis on Anthelmintic Activity and In silico Screening of Breast Cancer by using Mimosa pudica Linn.
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

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>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. Yes. Generally, the manuscript is important for scientific community as it presented an interesting topic</p> <p>2. Yes, except that the word "activity" was wrongly spelt in the title of the manuscript</p> <p>3. The authors are advised to avoid the use of personal pronoun such as "we" in the abstract as such word kept on appearing. More so, the abstract should be well coordinated such that it will present the skeletal summary of the entire work.</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. The references are though sufficient, the author needs to explore more recent reports</p> <p>In general, the topic is interesting and the quality of the redaction, cited references, as well as the conclusions of the manuscript, are acceptable for publication upon minor revision</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mela Yoro
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Kashere, Nigeria