

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_82152
Title of the Manuscript:	Coumarin: A Novel Tool for Multidisciplinary Activities
Type of the Article	Review 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>)

### **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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>1. The abstract and conclusion of the article are inconsistent with the description of the text. The abstract and conclusion show that the purpose of this paper was to try to cover work associated with structural modifications that gives significant pharmacological actions related to coumarins, the paper does not classify coumarins according to the types or structural modification types , the relationship between them is not fully summarized .And there are many similar articles only based on the efficacy of coumarin.</p> <p>2. In the text, more words were used to describe diseases and less related to coumarins, for example: Antiinflammatory activity: Anti-Alzheimer activity , more than half of the content is used to describe the relevant disease or background</p> <p>3. The logic of the titles of the text is not strong, for example, Anticancer Activity andCarbonic Anhydrase Inhibition are not a hierarchical level.</p>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>A lot of work has been done in Table 2, but there is a lack of induction and sorting. The types, configurations and functions of coumarins are not classified and sorted according to the research purpose of this paper. The table is too complicated.</p>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<p>The size of functional groups of structural formula in the table and text is inconsistent.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Li Qian
Department, University & Country	Gansu Agricultural University, China