

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_81891
Title of the Manuscript:	The role of Orosomucoid 2 and its protein Alpha-1-acid glycoprotein 2 in different diseases
Type of the 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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

[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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments Minor revisions are needed throughout the manuscript.	<p>Title</p> <p>- Please clarify title, "...Orosomuroid 2 and its protein Alpha-1-acid glycoprotein 2..." Are those two same? If yes, modify title and it can not be said as "and its"</p> <p>Study design</p> <p>Should gene names be marked as <i>ORM2</i>; <i>AGP2</i>; <i>AGP-B</i>; <i>AGP-B'</i></p> <p>Orosomuroid</p> <p>- Please, clarify. Not need to double write genes "...<i>ORM1</i> and <i>ORM2</i>, both <i>ORM1</i> and <i>ORM2</i> genes are positioned on..."</p> <p>- Please clarify this style to present "... A variants molar ratio in the blood are ~2 to 3:1,..."</p> <p>3.1.2 AGP2 protein</p> <p>- modify sentence, "...with an isoelectric point (pI = 5.03).." its little bit weird style to present. May all proteins have isoelectric point or not.. "...with an isoelectric point (pI) of 5.03.." or something</p> <p>- Figure 2, Is this really right name for the presentation of α and β-helixes "Carton representation...."</p> <p>3.2 Function of AGP2</p> <p>- "While other drugs such as <u>the basic drug</u> imipramine, methadone and disopyridamole show a higher affinity for AGP2" Is the undelined text needed?</p> <p>4.2 Disease marker and acute-phase reactant</p> <p>- Please modify the sentence little bit more understandable from the beginning, "The production of hepatic of many plasma proteins...."</p> <p>Should it be something like " The hepatic production of many plasma proteins..."</p> <p>- Paragraph 4.3 Conserving the capillary barrier function is quite short as previous and next.</p> <p>Coul those combine to one or could there be little bit more information? Example paragraph 4.3 Conserving the capillary barrier function is very interesting and it aroused interest to read more about that topic.</p> <p>- Table 2 Make little bit clearer, short and concise. Example Biological pathways title could be biological effects. All mentioned detailes are not exactly related to pathways but are more as explanatory. And example "contirbution" as action or mode of action</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<div>- Again, paragraphs could be longer as e.g. 5. AGP2 Involvement in Diseases</div> <div>- Table 3 is too far after mention first time in the text. Please, move closer.</div> <div>- Tables are hard to read and hard to get the message. Make clear and informative what was the main finding related to AGP2. Example from table 3 “AGP2 was found increased in autistic individuals compared to controls, as it was stated to be linked to autism.” That is informative and concise for reader.</div> <div>- Clarify figure 4 legend</div> <div>- 5.1 AGP2 contributions with diseases</div> <div>- modify text little bit end of the paragraph, “....permeability and participating in the therapy as summarized in figure 4”.</div> <div>- Alzheimer's Disease → mark Alzheimer's Disease (AD) first time abbreviations. Same to all abbreviations.</div> <div>- compaction and shortening could be done example in paragraphs 5.1.3 Glycosylation Modifications and 5.1.4 Capillary Permeability</div> <div>- Things that are not directly related to topic could be removed from all part because the text is really broad</div>	
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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Niina Bhattarai
Department, University & Country	University of Eastern Finland, Finland