

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_125906
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Potential EGFR Inhibitors for Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer: A Structure-Based Virtual Screening and Molecular Dynamics Study
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript addresses a crucial area in the fight against non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) by evaluating potential EGFR inhibitors through structure-based virtual screening and molecular dynamics studies. Its significance lies in the identification of promising drug candidates, offering new therapeutic options for EGFR-targeted treatments. I appreciate the detailed methodology, including ADME property analysis and molecular dynamics simulations, which strengthen the scientific validity of the findings. However, the manuscript could benefit from a deeper discussion of clinical implications and future experimental directions to enhance its impact.	Thank you for your valuable comments
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	Thank you for your valuable comments
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of the article provides a good overview of the study, including the focus on non-small cell lung cancer, EGFR as a drug target, the methodology (structure-based virtual screening, ADME property evaluation, molecular dynamics simulation), and a brief mention of in vitro cytotoxicity assays.	Thank you for your valuable comments
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	Thank you for your valuable comments
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound due to its use of well-established methods in drug discovery, including structure-based virtual screening, molecular docking, ADME property evaluation, and molecular dynamics simulations. The selection of EGFR as a target for non-small cell lung cancer is appropriate, given its critical role in tumor progression. The study employs reliable computational tools like Glide and Gromacs, which are widely recognized for their accuracy in predicting ligand-receptor interactions and protein-ligand complex stability. Additionally, the integration of in vitro cytotoxicity assays strengthens the study by providing experimental validation to support the computational predictions	Thank you for your valuable comments
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	Thank you for your valuable comments
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	Thank you for your valuable comments
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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>	N/A