

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_96057
Title of the Manuscript:	Polypharmacy in elderly people: A Simple Review
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalipri.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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The manuscript is more like a descriptive essay or a book chapter. A lot of resources have been cited but evidence and information are described only. There isn't a lot of 'reviewing' of the sources as it entails some level of analysis and critical appraisal of articles. For a descriptive piece, a lot of relevant information and research evidence have been compiled well. • There are some major flaws with the narrative of the whole piece. In many cases, sentences within a paragraph come off as disjointed with weak connections between them. Lot of information have been cited, but during that course, the narrative voice has been compromised. Some places feel like information dump rather than a logical piece. This is the same case with paragraphs too, there is lack of smooth flow between paragraphs. Authors can follow the basics of essay writing better; have one central point in each paragraph, substantiate it with evidence, then finally synthesize and summarize to bring all points together to the main point. • Comments based on the prompts <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is important for the scientific community as it delves into a relevant issue affecting a lot of people worldwide. 2. The title could be better; the second part 'a simple review' needs to probably be changed to something more appropriate. 3. The abstract is not well compiled. It is simply a collection of sentences directly from the main text and does not fully encapsulate the point of the whole article. 4. The subsections of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct too as not evidences and claims are grounded in literature, and the main points of the manuscript also goes along the same scientific constructs. 6. The references are sufficient and mostly correctly represented. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are major issues with the English language usage, English grammar of the manuscript. The main issue is the singular/plural error which is very rampant. There are other issues of spelling errors, tense errors, missing punctuations, incomplete sentences, etc. The manuscript needs a thorough review and editing by an English language expert. • There is a bit of repetitions throughout the essay. Some points or ideas have been stated multiple number of times and with the same wording. The manuscript can be further synthesized by removing repetitions 	
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Prakat Karki
Department, University & Country	CHRIST (Deemed to be) University, India