

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_124664
Title of the Manuscript:	Modulation of Tumor Suppressor Genes by Histone Deacetylase Inhibitors in Cancer Therapy
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 review looks at the use of HDAC inhibitors in cancer therapy from a different perspective, given what is known about HDAC inhibitors.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is clear, understandable, and related to the topic.	
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 review discusses the potential advantages of using HDAC inhibitors in cancer treatment by targeting their impact on tumor suppressor genes. It also clearly outlines the goals of the review and what it aims to perform in the abstract section.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections of the article are in harmony with each other.	
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.	The correction of the review is supported by references. I think that the study will be more effective if HDAC inhibitors and the association of these inhibitors with tumor suppressor genes are supported by a few more up-to-date data.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	It would be beneficial to include a few more recent references in the article. Recent research articles on HDAC inhibitors and their connection with tumor suppressor genes should also be included in the review article.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is clear and understandable and is also very suitable for scientific communication.	
Optional/General comments	The reference to Figure 3 should be indicated and the term "DAN Damage" in Figure 3 should be edited. The authors' names, surnames, and affiliated institutions must be given under the title. The article was conducted according to its purpose with a flow. After revision of the suggested changes, the review article can be prepared for publication in your journal.	

[Review Form 3](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ilayda Alcitepe
Department, University & Country	Ege University Faculty of Medicine, Turkey