

Review Form2

Book Name:	Disease and Health Research: New Insights
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2270
Title of the Manuscript:	Nanotechnology in the development of novel formulation for cancer treatment
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important because it addresses a critical area of research that has the potential to revolutionize cancer treatment. By focusing on nanotechnology, it provides insights into targeted drug delivery systems that could lead to more effective and personalized cancer therapies. The use of nanoparticles for drug delivery, imaging, and biomarker detection could significantly improve treatment outcomes and reduce the side effects associated with conventional cancer therapies.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the manuscript is suitable and accurately reflects the content of the chapter. It clearly conveys the focus on nanotechnology and its application in developing novel cancer treatments.	
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 is comprehensive and provides a good summary of the chapter's content. However, it could be improved by briefly mentioning the potential challenges and limitations of using nanotechnology in cancer treatment. This would provide a more balanced view of the topic.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of the manuscript is appropriate, with well-organized subsections that guide the reader through the various aspects of nanotechnology in cancer treatment. Each section is logically connected, providing a clear and coherent narrative.	
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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically sound, with well-supported arguments and up-to-date references. The discussion on the role of nanoparticles in drug delivery and the emphasis on precision medicine is particularly strong. The manuscript effectively highlights the potential of nanotechnology to improve cancer treatment outcomes.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :-	The references are sufficient and recent. They include key studies and reviews that support the arguments presented in the manuscript. No additional references are necessary at this time.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication. However, there are some minor grammatical errors and clumsy phrasing that should be corrected to improve readability. A thorough proofreading is recommended to ensure clarity and fluency.	
Optional/General comments	Abstract Improvement: Include a brief mention of the challenges and limitations of using nanotechnology in cancer treatment to provide a more balanced view. Language and Grammar: Review the manuscript for minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasing. A thorough proofreading is recommended. Conclusion: Strengthen the conclusion by summarizing the key points discussed in the chapter and highlighting the future directions for research in this field.	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohan Gandhi Bonthu
Department, University & Country	School of Pharmaceutical Analysis, Sandip University, India