

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_85706
Title of the Manuscript:	Properdin: a regulatory protein that functions beyond immune system regulation
Type of the Article	review

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 title is properdin but the review is more general about complements and complement inhibition. The review should be more precise and focused in whatever you want to express: Is it properdin as a complement inhibitor has therapeutic effect and should be considered. Will the tests determine diagnostic or properdin will be used for treatment. The differences about different complements are not precisely differentiated. For example disease prognosis or tumor metastasis. In which mechanism is it more evaluated. For example about covid-19 the data is very little and not well discussed. I think the authors should recise the review so that their emphasis should be stronger and more precise. Properdin or complement activation in diseases or cancer, their use in prediction or therapy of diseases, pharmacogenetic analysis for properdin or complement activation.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cengiz Mordeniz
Department, University & Country	Turkey