

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_81022
Title of the Manuscript:	“STRUCTURE BASED DRUG DISCOVERY, DOCKING, MODELLING, SYNTHESIS AND ANTICANCER SCREENING OF SOME NOVEL QUINOLINE DERIVATIVES”
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:

<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The authors reported an interesting topic for anticancer activity screening of synthesised of quinoline derivatives. The reported study was well selected while the manuscript was poor organized and the manuscript is written with great carelessness! Generally, it has interesting data and may be accepted for publication after following a major revision.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Abstract is very short Should be rewritten and organized with gradient information. 2- Introduction: I consider authors must be including more points clearly indicating the negative impact of breast cancer which is represented by cell line MCF-7 in their study. The following published articles may be useful in this way: https://doi.org/10.1007/s12029-021-00640-y and https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jphotochem.2021.113572 and https://doi.org/10.1016/j.semancer.2020.03.014 3- Methodology section written in a random form and should be re written 4- The result section: There is too much figures in the manuscript! 5- All figures unorganized 6- The sections of the cell line figures should be aggregated in one figure with sub numbers according to the treatment, 7- The figures ligand of the cell line didn't contain any information about the doses or concentrations of the compounds. 8- Table 3 didn't have description of abbreviations in the table ligand and the unit of the compound concentrations. 9- Figure 23 un required, delete this figure. 10- The result and discussion section didn't contain any interpretation to the result obtained in the figures and the data didn't discuss. This section should be rewritten in a correct manner. 11- References is too little. 12- The manuscript contains many English mistakes so, kindly, check for English correction by a native speaker. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- The section titles are confused to me (what is the difference between experimental and material and methods and methodology sections?) 2- The title material and method was repeated more than one time. 3- What Is the difference between image and figure? 4- The figures 1, 2, 3 and image 2! appeared so bad. 5- The Cell line: MCF-7 methodology shouldn't be notated so, rewritten this part in continuous form. And merge the materials I appropriate sites with the method of the MTT test 6- The ligand of the figures 9 and 12 is incomplete. 7- The manuscript has no pages and line numbers, and it is difficult to review. 8- All abbreviations used should be mentioned in the place of their first mention followed by an abbreviation and then only the abbreviation is written. 	
Optional/General comments	<p>The reported study was well selected while the manuscript was poor organized and the manuscript is written with great carelessness! Generally, it has interesting data and may be accepted for publication after following a major revision.</p>	

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:	Mohammed Abu-Elghait
Department, University & Country	Al-Azhar University, Egypt