

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_89397
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Molecular Docking of Mangrove Plant as Therapeutic Agent to Treat Non-Small Cell Lung Carcinoma</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Check the references in the article as an indication. So, take the same care with your references that you do with other aspects of your work. The effort is likely to serve you well.</b>	Results and discussion; Suggest improvements in the way data is shown • Comment on general logic and on justification of interpretations and conclusions. The first part of this section should repeat the main findings of the study and put them in the context of the study objectives and the published literature. This should be followed by an interpretation of the study findings, including implications for clinical care, healthcare policy, or future research directions. The results should be short and sweet, without verbiage. Mitchell (1968) quoted Einstein as having said, "If you are out to describe the truth, leave elegance to the tailor." Although the results section is the most important part, it is often the shortest, particularly if it is preceded by a well-written materials and methods section and followed by a well-written discussion.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<b>Abstract; Is it an appropriate length.</b> The abstract should never give any information or conclusion that is not stated in the paper. Literature must not be cited in the abstract (except in rare instances, such as modification of a previously published method). Likewise, normally the abstract should not include or refer to tables and figures	The abstract, not the conclusion, summarizes the study	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<b>Introduction; Does it really introduce and put into perspective what follows?</b> Suggest changes in organization and point authors to appropriate citations.	Language; Several times it has happened to Native English speakers I know that have excellent command of English writing that they get back their manuscripts with the comment that they should consult someone native in English.	

**Review Form 1.6**

**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>Abu-Hussein Muhamad</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Arab-American University, Palestine</b>