

Review Form2

Book Name:	Innovations in Biological Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2408
Title of the Manuscript:	Bioactive constituents isolated from Atractylodeslancea (Thunb) DC. rhizome exhibit synergistic effect against cholangiocarcinoma cell
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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.	The article entitled “Bioactive constituents isolated from Atractylodeslancea (Thunb) DC. rhizome exhibit synergistic effect against cholangiocarcinoma cell” is not unique and lacks novelty as a result the article requires major improvement to be published in this journal. The study seems to be preliminary.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title seems ok but very common; can be improved better to attract more readers	
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 seems ok but the article is not comprehensice; especially the results section; it has to be more elaborate.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections seems ok	
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 authors have only used some basic analytical techniques to support their findings. The experiments seem to be limited; however results are quite interesting to some extent. To my opinion this study needs major improvement for publication in your esteemed journal and I believe that with major improvements and specific revisions to the following, the manuscript could be relevant and interesting to readers. The following is a very limited list of points to consider - Albeit the authors highlight the synergistic potentials of bioactive constituents isolated from Atractylodeslancea (Thunb) DC. rhizome against cholangiocarcinoma cell. Nevertheless, further studies are required to unveil the actual molecular mechanism underlying this action. That would definitely provide an insight into their therapeutic potentials. - Definitely, the study would have been more relevant if the authors have extended to bring out their plausible molecular mechanism. - The article lacks coherence, and the articulation of the sentences is somewhat poor which makes it bit difficult to read. Also, throughout the document, there are motherhood statements. There is a need for significant revision of grammar and syntax. Please use simple, scientific language. I recommend thorough proofreading of the whole document. The title of the	

Review Form2

	manuscript should also be improved; in its present form it looks quite vague. 4. Figures pixels are too poor; they are unacceptable in the present form. 5. Figure legends are inappropriately and poorly described. Figure legends should independently explain the figures and should be standalone. 6. The discussion has to be improved through various corners. More importantly, it should be enriched to answer the molecular mechanisms for this synergistic effects. Overall, the study needs much improvement for publication.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are not sufficient and not recent. Some of the sentences are not supported by adequate and requisite references	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article lacks coherence, and the articulation of the sentences is somewhat poor which makes it bit difficult to read. Also, throughout the document, there are motherhood statements. There is a need for significant revision of grammar and syntax. Please use simple, scientific language. I recommend thorough proofreading of the whole document.	
Optional/General comments	The article needs much improvement to be published in present form.	

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:	Farheen Badrealam Khan
Department, University & Country	College of Medicine and Health Sciences, Khalifa University, UAE