

## Review Form 1.6

The paper

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_81941
Title of the Manuscript:	ACTIVITY OF HYDROETHANOLIC LEAF EXTRACT OF TECOMA STANS AGAINST BREAST CANCER CELLS LINE - MCF - 7
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:

(<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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The paper presents useful and interesting evidence, but the way it's written should be improved. The paper in general is written in short sentences with no cohesion, especially the introduction. The text includes several questionable assumptions, contradictory affirmations, incomplete sentences and the writing style is not very technical.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>“The experience from our previous studies 4 5,6 5789108,101112 13 have led us to focus on the current topic.”</p> <p>“Our team has extensive knowledge and research experience that has translate into high quality publications 15–22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30–3”</p> <p>Those above are unnecessary self-referring and the second sentence is out of format. In my vision, those could be included with a proper reason, but in this way, every researcher could simply refer oneself's papers on every publication.</p> <p>The objectives of the paper should be included on the text itself (it only appears on the abstract) and they could be more detailed, like mentioning the genes which expression were observed</p> <p>“Gene expression analysis by Real Time-PCR” This topic is out of format</p> <p>“Most people are not aware that the species Tecoma stans have anticancer properties in their leaf extracts” This information should be excluded. This information also disagrees to the affirmation the paper does about not existing articles of anticancer properties of Tecoma stans, as it follows.</p> <p>The topic about statistic analysis could detail which data were analysed.</p> <p>The two last topics on Results section are written exactly the same way, lacking cohesion</p> <p>“There are no previous articles of anticancer properties of Tecoma stans.” An information like this should be presented in a more cautious way. It is hard to affirm such thing, especially because it's possible to find studies about it, just like the following examples: <a href="#">21.pdf (innovareacademics.in)</a> Kameshwaran S, Suresh V, Arunachalam G, Kanthlal SK, Mohanraj M. In vitro and in vivo anticancer activity of methanolic flower extract of <i>Tecoma stans</i> flower. Int Res J Pharm. 2012;3(3):246–252 The discussion should consider the available evidence about the topic</p> <p>The second and third paragraphs of the Discussion section should be moved to introduction</p> <p>Bcl-xl mRNA expression was mentioned to be significantly reduced on Results section, but not significantly reduced on Discussion section</p> <p>“If a large-scale study is done on Tecoma stans for anticancer activity against breast cancer” Not only large scale studies, but they would need to be clinical trials or another acceptable study design in humans</p> <p>“it can be identified and cured completely without any side effects and usage of synthetic and harmful chemotherapies as it is natural” Questionable informations</p>	

**Review Form 1.6**

	<b>“harmful chemotherapies as it is natural” This information is questionable as some plants are poisonous, for example.</b>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer’s comment</b>	<b>Author’s comment</b> <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>
<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>Paula Medeiros do Valle</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Instituto de Medicina Social, Brasil</b>