

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_83018
Title of the Manuscript:	Cisplatin and Nano-Particle Formulations of Cisplatin For Cancer Therapy: A Review
Type of the Article	Review 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>)

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 Review Article entitled "Cisplatin and Nano-Particle Formulations of Cisplatin For Cancer Therapy" claims to report the comparative findings over the recent advancements, developments, innovations, and updated literature for various CDDP nano-carrier systems.</p> <p>Starting from the title, we can say that since already in the introduction, Authors write almost only of cervical cancer, and very little of the other types of cancer in which cDDP is used, the title should be modified reporting that the review refers almost only to this tumor. Or alternatively, this part on the cervical cancer could be resized and introduce the other tumors a little more extensively.</p> <p>Moreover, the whole part on the pharmacology of the cDDP appears very preponderant over the part of nanotechnology dedicated to the cDDP, of which there is probably little research. So, for this but also other reasons, the whole review appears quite unbalanced. Some more recent reviews on the pharmacology of cDDP should be included or replace older ones.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Many editorial oversights, especially in references: For example, Ref. 15, the year of publication is missing; Ref. 52 and 54 should be the same; Ref 80 has the wrong name; etc.</p>	
Optional/General 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:	Gaetano Marverti
Department, University & Country	University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, Italy