

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_95883
Title of the Manuscript:	Scope of Pharmacovigilance: Comprehensive 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.journalcsij.com/index.php/CSIJ/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<b>1 This manuscript is important for scientific community. Pharmacovigilance is an essential part of current drug use, and there are common adverse drug reactions, so it is necessary to study the scope of pharmacovigilance and the establishment of drug guidelines to guide clinical use.</b> <b>2 The title of the manuscript is reasonable.</b> <b>3 The summary of this article is not comprehensive enough.</b> <b>4 Subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate.</b> <b>5 The manuscript is scientifically correct.</b> <b>6 References for this manuscript are recent but not sufficient. Many places need additional references to support the author's view.</b> <b>1 Lines 34-35. 'A.D.R.s still standing as one of the top ten leading causes of death in certain nations.' This view requires citation of the reference.</b> <b>2 Lines 84-86. The first example given by the authors should cite the literature as the last two examples do.</b> <b>3 Lines 118-120. This view requires citation of the reference.</b> <b>4 Lines 134-136. The description here is too broad, need to be more specific, you can give a typical example to prove the author's point.</b> <b>5 Lines 166-186. Type A-Type F. It would be more convincing if you could give an example of each one to support it.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The manuscript should carefully be checked by someone fluent in English or a professional language editing service in terms of both English language and scientific merit.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	No comments at this time.	

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Li Wen
Department, University & Country	Hubei University of Chinese Medicine, China