



Name:	<u>UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY</u>
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_UPJOZ_3586
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of In-vitro ovarian anticancer activity (Ovarian Cancer Cells-PA1) and zebrafish embryo toxicity of Parmelia perlata ethanolic extract
Type of the Article	Research Article

1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's feedback
Compulsory REVISION comments		
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	Yes	This manuscript investigates the antibacterial, anti-inflammatory and anticancer properties of <i>Parmelia perlata</i> ethanolic extract, focusing on its effects against human ovarian (PA-1) cancer cells and various bacterial strains. The study highlights significant inhibitory activity, particularly against <i>E. coli</i> bacteria. Additionally, the extract's safety was confirmed through toxicity tests on zebrafish embryos, indicating its potential as a safer alternative to conventional chemotherapy. Further research is warranted to explore its clinical applications and efficacy in cancer treatment. Thank you for the valuable comment.
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	Thank you for suggesting the title.
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Yes	Thank you for the valuable comment.
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	Thank you for the valuable comment.
5. Do you think the manuscript is	Yes	Thank you for your valuable comment.



<p>scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes, the references are sufficient as per the study. No suggestion for additional references. Thank you so much for your valuable comments.</p>
---	-------------------	--

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>Here are the critical shortcomings identified in the manuscript:</p> <p>The introduction provides a broad overview of ovarian cancer but does not thoroughly review recent literature on similar studies using lichen extracts, limiting the context for understanding the novelty and relevance of this research.</p> <p>The manuscript does not provide sufficient details on the procedures used for the phytochemical analysis, antioxidant activity assay, and anti-inflammatory tests. This makes it difficult to replicate the study or assess the reliability of the methods used.</p> <p>Some results are presented without proper context or comparative data, such as the specific methods and standards used for the antibacterial and anticancer activity assessments. This leads to difficulties in evaluating the efficacy and significance of the findings.</p> <p>The discussion section lacks a comprehensive analysis of the results. It does not adequately compare the findings with existing literature or explain the potential mechanisms behind the observed bioactivities.</p> <p>The manuscript does not provide details on the statistical methods used to analyze the data.</p>	<p>Thank you for the valuable time taken for correcting this manuscript. We have edited the revised manuscript as per the reviewers' comments as per the knowledge.</p> <p>About the plant details have added in introduction.</p> <p>The references have added based on the following methods to reduce the plagiarism.</p> <p>The methods and standards are added with the proper comparative data to specific results.</p>
---------------------------------------	---	---

	<p>This omission raises concerns about the robustness and reliability of the conclusions drawn from the experimental results.</p> <p>The conclusions drawn about the toxicity of <i>P. peralta</i> on zebrafish embryos are not well-supported by detailed data or comparative analysis with control groups and established toxicity standards.</p> <p>There are minor formatting issues and occasional grammatical errors throughout the manuscript, which detract from the overall clarity and professionalism of the document.</p> <p>These points highlight areas where the manuscript could be improved to strengthen its scientific rigor and clarity.</p>	<p>In the discussion section, comprehensive analysis have added in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>The manuscript has provided the statistical methods used to analyse the data.</p> <p>Revised the manuscript in conclusion.</p> <p>The grammatical errors are revised in the manuscript.</p>
Optional 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><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></i>	