

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_98280
Title of the Manuscript:	Reprofiling Hydrogen Peroxide from Antiseptics to Pyolytics: A Narrative Overview of the History of Inventions in Russia
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:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yes, It is crucial for researchers to provide information for further research activities.</li> <li>2. Yes, It is moderately suitable.</li> <li>3. Yes, It is moderately articulated.</li> <li>4. Yes, It is moderately appropriate.</li> <li>5. Yes, It is moderately accepted.</li> <li>6. Yes, it is sufficient but needs to be revisited by including recent empirical results.</li> </ol> <p><i>Memo: Please look seriously at the comments so that the researcher will revisit the paper in line with the comments to maintain the credibility of the journal.</i></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	-It is moderately suitable, even if it needs a major correction.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	It is preferable to revisit the introduction, methodology, and analysis methods section.	

### 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)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Yenhun Taye Engida</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Dire Dawa University, Ethiopia</b>