SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_66011**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Therapeutic Value of 6-Gingerol (1-[4′-hydroxy-3′-methoxyphenyl]-5-hydroxy-3-decanone): A review**
Type of the Article	**review**

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/journal/10/editorial-policy)

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	**The manuscript needs major revision. The language of writing is not scientific in various parts of the text. A lot of references were listed, namely 84, but references from 54 to 84 are not mentioned in the text. They are only present in Table 1. Usually in the review articles at least some comments / comparisons / descriptions are written the text about all references. This should be done. Further on, Figures 2, 3 and 4 are also not described in the text, which must be corrected.** **In my opinion, the core of the manuscript should be rewritten according to the comments. I added my other minor comments in the word.doc. The conclusion part is o.k. only minor revisions such as italic for "*in vitro*" are needed.**	A thorough major revision is been done with respect to scientific writing and language. The references listed from 54 to 84 are been pooled as table to depict them in a single table due to numerous references and thus, cannot be displayed in text. Comments on Table 1. has been inserted in the text. Core manuscript is been rewritten according to the comments. Italicising is been done for all needy words like Gingiber officinalis, in vitro, in vivo and via.
Minor REVISION comments	Through all manuscript "*in vitro*" and "*in vivo*" should be italic. And there are some typing mistakes.	All the minor comments are been edited and corrected.
Optional/General comments		

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)*	