

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_59722
Title of the Manuscript:	KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDE AND AWARENESS TOWARDS BENEFITS OF LAVENDER OIL
Type of the Article	Original Research


General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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 highlight that part in the manu- his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	 The present study assessed the knowledge and awareness about the benefits of lavender oil among people, by using a survey on one hundred persons. This is a good study that I consider that is important and represent a report on the personal evaluation/perception of the impact of the lavender oil on human health. The authors need to address the below comments to strengthen the quality of the manuscript: Please add the version of the SPSS software that you used in the study. Please include the age and gender of the participants as these are extremely important in this study. Please rewrite Conclusions, as in the present form it appears phrases such as: From this study, it is evident that the majority of them were aware of uses and medicinal benefits of lavender oil". Please represent the data as pies, not columns. Please check the English in the text (e.g. Grammarly software). 	
Minor REVISION comments	-	
Optional/General comments	-	



SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

		Author's comment (if agreed wi that part in the manuscript. It is n feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u> It is not ethical to have so many self-citations: ref. 11-25. I recommend keeping a maximum of 3 self-citations, the most related to this topic.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dana Maria Copolovici
Department, University & Country	Aurel Vlaicu University of Arad, Romania

l with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight s mandatory that authors should write his/her