

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of International Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JIRMEPS_12274
Title of the Manuscript:	Pharmacology of PARP Inhibitors: Targeted Therapy for Cancers
Type of the Article	Review Article

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>
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is highly valuable to the scientific community due to its comprehensive review of PARP inhibitors (PARPi), focusing on their pharmacokinetics, indications, dosages, adverse effects, and strategies to overcome resistance. It consolidates current knowledge on a crucial class of drugs in cancer therapy, highlighting their clinical applications and ongoing research directions. I appreciate the thoroughness in covering multiple PARPi and their distinct pharmacological profiles, which is essential for clinicians and researchers navigating treatment options and potential combinatorial therapies.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title "A Comprehensive Review of PARP Inhibitors in Cancer Therapy" accurately reflects the manuscript's comprehensive nature and relevance to oncology.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>By improving the structure and reducing unnecessary details, your abstract can be improved and more attractive to academic readers.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Regarding the subsections and structure of the manuscript, Ensure each subsection clearly contributes to the overall objective of the article. If subsections or sections veer into tangential topics unrelated to the main theme, it can disrupt the logical coherence of the structure.</p>	

<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>In terms of scientific robustness and technical soundness, the manuscript demonstrates several strengths: The manuscript thoroughly covers the relevant literature and provides a comprehensive analysis of the topic, ensuring that all key aspects are addressed. The manuscript effectively integrates empirical evidence and theoretical insights, demonstrating a deep understanding of the subject matter and ensuring a robust scientific foundation.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. :</p>	<p>The references cited are sufficient and predominantly recent, reflecting current literature on PARP inhibitors in cancer therapy. To further enrich the manuscript, considering recent clinical trial outcomes or studies focusing on novel PARP inhibitor combinations could provide additional context and support for the discussed strategies against resistance.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language used in the manuscript is suitable for scholarly communication, demonstrating clarity and precision in scientific terminology. Minor revisions for grammatical accuracy and clarity of expression could enhance readability further</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Some sections may lack sufficient depth in analysis or discussion of key findings. Strengthening these areas with more detailed exploration of implications or further research directions would enhance the manuscript's academic impact.</p>	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sargol Aminnezhad
Department, University & Country	Alzahra University, Iran