

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_95399
Title of the Manuscript:	Overview on Juvenile Psoriatic Arthritis
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> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> This study describes about treatment, etiology and epidemiology of juvenile idiopathic arthritis. The manuscript is poor in relevant information.</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> No, it's not. Overview on Juvenile Psoriatic Arthritis: literature review</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> No, it's not. The abstract needs to be rewritten.</p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> No, it's not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Abstract is not structured</li> <li>• Keywords were not displayed</li> <li>• The study does not present materials and methods</li> </ul> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> The study does not present materials and methods. The criteria for inclusion/exclusion of the studies were not informed, nor the methodology for the acquisition of the studies used.</p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent?</b> Yes, it is.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes, it is.	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Sávio Morato de Lacerda Gontijo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Centro Universitário UNA, Brazil</b>