

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JPRI_95526 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | In silico Design of new hydroxamic acid derivatives Inhibitors of Plasmodium falciparum M1 metallo aminopeptidase with favorable pharmacokinetic profile |
| 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:

(<https://www.journalipri.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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments) | 1. Yes, it is very important for scientific community. This manuscript brings news for the treatment of a very impactful disease in the world. Interesting how it will contribute to the treatment. 2. It's could be better, more simple and direct. 3. In the abstract there is a mistake, the spelling of protozoan is wrong. But it is very clear, it passes on the important information 4. Yes, they are appropriate for understanding the manuscript. 5. Yes, I think. has some corrections/suggestions, such as making the title more direct/objective so that it highlights the importance of the manuscript and thus increases interest. 6. The references are sufficient as to quantity, but could have more up-to-date references | The corrections are highlighted in the text |
| Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language can be reviewed by a specialist as to how to word some paragraphs | |
| 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) | |