



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_40300
Title of the Manuscript:	Insilico analysis for DPYD gene and the effect of the mutation DPD enzyme
Type of the 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>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	It was a pleasure to review this manuscript. Overall, the manuscript presents interesting computational results. I recommend it for publication, however in order to clarify some English mistakes (which are not so crucial), I recommend the following topics: *Please, change "insilico" for "in silico" *Please, change "solf-ware" for "software" *Please, change "homosapie" for "homosapien" *Please, check if the term "Homosapins" is correct in the page 3, line 150. *Please, change "residu" for "residue" (line 218) In the Figure 1-4 (line 232), check the protonation and/or deprotonation state of carboxylic and amine groups in the "Hope Original and Hope Mutant" under pH used in the studies. See pKa values for each case.	We greatly appreciate the reviewer's efforts to carefully review the paper and the valuable suggestions offered. All changes and corrections suggested by the reviewer were performed and highlighted in yellow colour. In the Figure 1-4 (line 232), We did not get what the reviewer mean.
Optional/General comments		