



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_22023
Title of the Manuscript:	RESCUING ABANDONED MOLECULES AS Nav1.7 AND PCSK9 INHIBITORS
Type of the Article	Short 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The article reports an interesting methodology to use numerous unexploited compounds developed/synthesized by academic institutes for medical applications. However, abstract, introduction and conclusion should be re written giving emphasis on its applicability.	We thank the reviewer for the suggestion . Abstract, introduction and conclusion were arranged to fit a short research article therefore we highly considered restrictions to not exceed the appropriate length limits of a short research article. We believed the background reasons of carrying out a repositioning/rescuing strategy were clearly enough. Nevertheless as suggested from the reviewer in order to strenght the potential and the applicability domain of the approach to develop new drugs some sentences were added to abstract, introduction and conclusion . These sentences are also supported by recent references. We are totally disposed to <i>de-novo</i> re-write the above mentioned sections whether the reviewer shouldn' t be totally satisfied.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Pl check line 37 where is a ? , is it typo error or text is missing.	It is a typo which was corrected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall an interesting article.	