

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_73706
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF CYTARABINE AND CYCLOCYTIDINE ON ACTIVATION OF HUMAN T CELLS – CYTARABINE AND CYCLOCYTIDINE HAVE CONCENTRATION-DEPENDENT EFFECTS THAT ARE MODULATED BY EMOXIPINE
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title: Not very clear, please make it more specific 2. Abstract: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Please add title to introduction portion of abstract, to make things easy for readers. b. Appears to be written hurriedly with spelling mistakes (eg: 'anioxidants') 3. Introduction: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Please provide current status of both Cytarabine and cycloctidine in treatment of leukemia to impress on readers about the impact of study. b. Current status of use of antioxidants along with cytotoxic therapy c. Please add other studies conducted on antioxidant used in study (emoxipine). Any approved indication for the same anywhere globally 4. Material and methods: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Please add the approval number provided by ethics committee b. Most procedure mentioned do not carry references, kindly add adequate references. c. Please provide basis for selecting cycloctidine to compare with cytosine Arabinoside. 5. Results: Why intergroup comparison not considered in the study, it would have provided more information 6. Discussion: It would be advisable to add other studies that are similar to provide readers an holistic view on current thinking undergoing in scientific arena 	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	Tejus A
Department, University & Country	India