



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



**1: Review Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's feedback
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b>  (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	Yes	
<b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b>  (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
<b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>	Yes	
<b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Yes	
<b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>	Yes	
<b>6. Are the references sufficient</b>	Yes	



and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.

(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)



<p><b>Minor</b> 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. 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. perlata</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>	
<b>Optional</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	



**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ishan Pandey</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Moti Lal Nehru Medical College, India</b>