



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 " <i>in vitro</i> " are needed.	
Minor REVISION comments	Through all manuscript " <i>in vitro</i> " and " <i>in vivo</i> " should be italic. And there are some typing mistakes.	
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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Barbara Dariš
Department, University & Country	Univerza V Mariboru Rektorat, Slovenia