

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_128435
Title of the Manuscript:	Nelarabine in T-Cell Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia: An Analysis of the Literature
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>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides a comprehensive exploration of nelarabine as a promising therapeutic option for T-cell acute lymphoblastic leukemia (T-ALL), addressing the critical need for novel treatment strategies for this aggressive cancer. It emphasizes the importance of targeted therapies, highlighting nelarabine's unique mechanism of action, which selectively disrupts T-cell DNA synthesis and induces apoptosis. By synthesizing findings from clinical trials, the manuscript underscores nelarabine's potential to improve survival outcomes, particularly in relapsed or refractory cases. The detailed analysis of combination therapies and its pediatric and adult efficacy underscores its versatility and promise. Additionally, it sheds light on safety concerns such as neurotoxicity and myelosuppression, advocating for vigilant patient monitoring. This work significantly contributes to the scientific community's efforts to refine T-ALL treatment and optimize patient care.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is suitable.	
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 abstract is thorough and well-written but could be slightly more concise and focused to improve clarity. It does a good job of setting up the main article and framing nelarabine as a promising therapy for T-ALL.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	24 from 44 references are 3 years old (54%) which is more than sufficient.	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The review presents a thorough and insightful analysis of the topic. However, I would like to provide a few minor suggestions that could enhance the overall readability and impact of the article.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Paragraph Structure: It would be beneficial to reduce the number of paragraphs in the manuscript. Currently, the review contains 36 paragraphs over 7 pages, which can make the article feel fragmented and harder to navigate. A more concise paragraph structure would improve readability, increase focus, and enhance the cohesion of the content. This would make the review more engaging and allow readers to follow the narrative more easily. 2) Inclusion of Visual Elements: The addition of at least one figure to the review would significantly improve its accessibility. Visual aids, such as graphs, tables, or diagrams, can enhance the clarity of complex information, allowing readers to more easily digest and understand key concepts. Furthermore, figures would provide visual support for the textual content, thereby strengthening the scholarly value of the review and aiding in the synthesis of the material presented. 3) Conclusion Section: It would be beneficial to add a dedicated "Conclusion" paragraph to summarize the main findings and implications of the review. This section would provide a clear and concise wrap-up of the article, helping readers grasp the key takeaways and the broader significance of the review's content. <p>By implementing these suggestions, the article will become more cohesive, accessible, and engaging for a wider audience.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Ivan Chernikov</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>The Scripps Research Institute, USA</p>