

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_74463
Title of the Manuscript:	VIRTUAL SCREENING TO IDENTIFY THE PROTEIN NETWORK INTERACTION OF THEOPHYLLINE IN RED COMPLEX PATHOGENS
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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Grammar and punctuation marks (comma, dot, etc.) need to be paid more attention to for a perfect article. Some sentences should be rewritten and the number of your references cited in the paper should be put in the right positions. For example: In the "introduction" part, (5) should be in front of the dot: "months and adults.(5)" 	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The article used comparative and analytical methods which are quite easy to understand and interesting. The topic is appropriate for publication. The comprehensive and balanced coverage of the topic is quite good The technical depth of the paper is appropriate for the generally knowledgeable individual working in the field The technical novelty of the paper is novel Regarding the overall organization of the paper, the title and the length of the abstract are both satisfactory, the appropriate length of the paper is appreciated. Regarding the English usage: Satisfactory The list of references: Satisfactory The appropriateness of this paper for publication: Good Match 	

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:	Huynh Tan Hoi
Department, University & Country	FPT University, Vietnam