

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77870
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of anti-cancer activity of Saraca asoca flower extract against lung cancer cell line
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:

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

**Review Form 1.6**

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Line 8 (Abstract)</b> → MTT is directly mentioned, its full form should be stated first.</p> <p><b>Lines 8; 14 &amp; 16 (Abstract)</b> → Irregular spacings (for example between extract and was). Such irregular spacings are prevalent throughout the paper. This needs to be thoroughly checked.</p> <p>A <b>dedicated future scope</b> is missing. Since the topic is quite trendy as well as in tune with the scope of the journal, a future projection of carried out work should be portrayed for better understanding to the research community.</p> <p><b>Page 3 → Line 5 →</b> Absence of commas and change in font (times new roman is replaced by Arial font) in citations (20) (21) .....            Additionally, same mistake is present in citations (49) (50) ..... (63) which is in last line of discussion section.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>The author can work on improving the sentencing and English skills so that a better portrayal of the research can be presented.</p> <p>The manuscript projects the idea that references are added just to increase the number of pages of the manuscript. For example, last line of discussion contains 15 reference citations. This idea does not present a linear appreciable flow.</p> <p>Somewhere down the line it feels like the results and discussion contents are desynchronized. An equilibrium is not being sensed out of it. It would be highly appreciable if the discussion is made sounder and crisper.</p> <p>The last line of abstract seems inadequate. The author should have a look at it.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	--	

**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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Kavita Sharma</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Govt. Arts and Commerce Girls College, Raipur, India</b>