SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_59477**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Potential anticancer effects of Aged Garlic Extract and its water-soluble organosulfur compounds**
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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/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. The abstract is not adequate** **2. No consistency with reference** **3. The aim of the study is not stated in the introduction** **4. The introduction does not capture cancer, its prevalence, effects and economic burden.** **5. You are expected to review researches on the effect of aged garlic extract only on different types of cancer** **6. The conclusion is too long and consist of reference (please remove references from the conclusion)**	1. I thank the reviewer for the suggestion. The abstract has now been modified. 2. References have now been properly arranged in the manuscript. 3. I thank the reviewer for pointing it out. Aim of the study has now been mentioned in the manuscript. 4. I thank the reviewer for the suggestion. I have now added information in the introduction section about cancer burden, prevalence, effects and economic burden. 5. I thank the reviewer for the query. I had already mentioned in the manuscript about the constituents of aged garlic extract viz. SAC and SMAC, which play important role in cancer treatment. 6. I thank the reviewer for the suggestion. I have now modified the conclusion section according to the reviewer's suggestion. Conclusion has been shortened and references have been removed.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		• All the changes have been highlighted in the manuscript.

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)*	