



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Cancer and Tumor International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JCTI_48302
Title of the Manuscript:	Immunomodulatory Fungi: an alternative for the treatment of cancer
Type of the Article	Review Paper

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>)

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)
--	---------------------------	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>Kindly elaborate Table 1. Main fungi with immunomodulatory activities and include details about the activities. Kindly re-check the abbreviations as there are some mistakes. Kindly recheck Table 2. Immunomodulatory activities of polysaccharides. There are number of mistakes about compounds and incomplete information. The title is also not suitable as these are information about fungi. There is no explanation to co-relate immunomodulatory activity with anti-cancer among these fungi. Forexamples there is no need to put general information about Agaricus Bisporus, Pleurotus Ostreatus, Lentinula Edodes. There is a need to add only relevant information to prove the correlation between anti-cancer and compounds identified. Composition of polysaccharides is not relevant and no need to put</p> <p>There are number of flaws in the conclusion such as claims are too high without any proper citation. secondly, the information given is too general and not focus on anti-cancer and immunomodulatory activity. Role of Biological Response Modifiers need to explain inside the literature review rather than inside the conclusion. There is a lack of future directions as well.</p>	<p>The manuscript has been modified accordingly</p>
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	