



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_47476
Title of the Manuscript:	In vitro study the impact of algae extracts as anti-proliferative against cancer cell line
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Change the title to “<i>In-vitro</i> study of anti-proliferation potentials of algae extract on cancer cell line”</p> <p>Specific which algae species was used.</p> <p>The background and result presentation in the abstract is poor. They are highlighted in red. Recast.</p> <p>There are lots of grammatical errors in the manuscript. Work on them.</p> <p>Recast the places that are highlighted in red.</p> <p>Remove the area highlighted in blue in the introduction and ensure you edit yourself. Avoid irrelevant information.</p> <p>In the result and discussion, you presented glutathione to be both an enzymatic and non enzymatic antioxidant. Verify.</p> <p>There is no assuming... see the third paragraph in the result and discussion section.</p> <p>The result appears not to have replicate. This is unscientific; there should always be a way to check the variability. There is also a dual result presentation for each of the result. Choose one and still to it. If you are to use figures, do not fail to also give a heading for each figure.</p> <p>Stick to the referencing methods in both the body of the work and the reference section.</p> <p>The discussion is vague. It failed to expound the outcome of the results.</p>	<p>Correction done</p> <p>Revised as per the comments</p> <p>Correccted</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Attend to the issues raised above.	



SDI 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>	