



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Cancer and Tumor International</u>
Manuscript Number:	2015_JCTI_17780
Title of the Manuscript:	Potential Antineoplastic Structural Variations of Uracil Mustard (Uramustine) Retaining Cytotoxic Activity and Drug-likeness Suitable for Oral Administration
Type of the Article	Original Research 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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<p>Potential Antineoplastic Structural Variations of Uracil Mustard (Uramustine) Retaining Cytotoxic Activity and Drug-likeness Suitable for Oral Administration</p> <p>The title of the article is excellent. It carries good informative messages to the physicians who deal with this drug.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are some grammatical mistakes in the paper, results in ambiguity of meaning of the sentences. • The spelling should be checked. • • • • It necessary to quote the list of abbreviations. • As it is a research study, author's contributions are necessary to mentioned. • In the result, as a test of significance, rho test and students't' test not done, please clarify. • As it is a vast research, it is mandatory to notice source of funding. • • • • Was permission taken from the ethical committee? • 	<p>The paper has been re-examined for grammar which corrections indicated in YELLOW HIGHLIGHT. Spelling has been rechecked.</p> <p>Abbreviations have been completed at the end of the text and YELLOW HIGHLIGHTED.</p> <p>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS have been added to the end of manuscript.</p> <p>NO ETHICAL APPROVAL is required and is added to paper. No patients or CONSENT is required for</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were the patient followed –up? How long? • What were the parameters for follow-up of patients to see the effects of drugs? • • • • Conflicts of interest are not mentioned. • • • • In conclusion, details of the paper are written. It can be added in the discussion chapter with appropriate references. • What are the further suggestions of this study? • The conclusion must be pin-point which can help the readers to get the appropriate messages of the paper. <p>Ethical issues:- Yes, It carries good informative messages to the physicians who deal with this drug.</p>	<p>paper and this is added to end of manuscript.</p> <p>NO COMPETING INTEREST is declared for the manuscript.</p> <p>Information in the CONCLUSION has been removed or added to DISCUSSION. Notes for additional studies have been added to the end of the CONCLUSION: "Variation of physicochemical properties can benefit the efficacy of anticancer drugs and should be further investigated for the benefit of patients".</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		