

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	<u>From Muds to Meds: Cockle shell-derived nanoparticles as drug carrier against breast cancer</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2744
Title of the Manuscript:	From Muds to Meds: Cockle shell-derived nanoparticles as drug carrier against breast cancer
Type of the Article	Monograph

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Yes, it is an interesting and up-to-date topic. overall, it is an useful article. I have announced my comments below.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	In my opinion, it is better to change the first part of the title, From Muds to Meds. It is better to change the title of the article by the respected author because the idea and thought are his and the related articles that he has reviewed can help him. Even in my opinion, it is better to read more articles to make the article more comprehensive.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of the article is comprehensive and complete. The arrangement of the summary is good, but in my opinion, it would be better if the type of writing and phrasing were changed a little.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>The number of sub-sections is large and has made the article unclear. The arrangement of the contents and titles are scattered and do not have a specific framework. First, you should determine the frame and then place the contents in it. It is better to put the related sections together under one title so that the contents are coherent. For example, drug delivery and its contents should come one after the other and end, or, for example, the use of inorganic nanoparticles should all be gathered in one place, and so on. The "Introduction" No research background has been used. Certainly, many studies and researches have been conducted and each of them have obtained results, none of which have been mentioned here. I suggest you use the studies and experiences of other researchers and bring them here. Then tell about your work and mention the difference between your work and other researches and explain the importance of your work.</p> <p>It is better to explain a little more about the importance of using natural structures in the development of new drugs, as well as the synergy of experimental methods and molecular docking.</p> <p>Synthesis of calcium carbonate nanoparticles is very brief. The Characteristics of CaCO<sub>3</sub> nanoparticles section is very brief. It is better to move these along with 1.7 and 1.8 to the material and methods section. Reading more articles will help the author.</p> <p>The arrangement and method of writing the materials in the material and methods is appropriate.</p> <p>In results and discussion, In the results and discussion, due to the fact that a work is a</p>	

[Review Form2](#)

	<p>combination of different disciplines such as chemistry, nano and biology, but no special explanation was given about the chemistry and nano section. It is mostly in the field of pathology and biology. As Commercialization is a complex process, this matter is briefly mentioned. In my opinion, it is better to move this part to the Conclusion part with more complete explanations .</p> <p>In conclusion, it is better to include information about limitations and future directions. The conclusion is very brief.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Altogether, the sentences are appropriate and scientifically a good work has been done.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes, they are new references. But as it was said in the previous section, it is better to add the sources related to the relevant research (research background).</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The sentences are appropriate.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>No special figure or diagram is used in the introduction. Only the shape is related to the Blood cockle shells. It is better to include figures from the work steps. There are only figures related to the results section.</p>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Saeideh Hosseini
Department, University & Country	Iran