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	In my opinion, the paper could be improved following these recommendations: 1) I suggest to cut the Table 1 in two parts, because it is difficult to read 2)Please discuss the possibility to use also ginger peels as bioactive compounds not only crude extract (see the paper Tinello F., Lante A. Valorisation of Ginger and Turmeric Peels as Source of Natural Antioxidants (2019) Plant Foods for Human Nutrition 2019-06-10 | DOI: 10.1007/s11130-019-00748-4 3) The Conclusions should not be repetition of the previous paragraphs. They should be more concise and outline the main outcomes 4) There are different characters in the references numbers 44 and 45.	1) The Table is been edited according to both the reviewers comments and now it is edited in such as way that it is very much readable and convenient for reader to follow up. Thus, it is not divided into parts to maintain the flow of information. 2) The aim and objective of the manuscript was on the phytochemical compound -6-gingerol. So, discussion on this matter by authors concluded as it is impertinent to the topic and leads to diversion, rather on the main topic. 3) The repetitive sentences in the conclusion is been edited and made concise as per the marking. 4) Different characters in the references numbers 44 and 45 are been edited.
Minor REVISION comments		
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)*	