

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_122731
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSOCIATION BETWEEN MATERNAL-NEONATAL SEPARATION STRESS AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF ALGIAS IN PRECLINICAL TRIALS: AN INTEGRATIVE LITERATURE REVIEW
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The paper provided a scientific review of the papers who have studied the influence of maternal separation on susceptibility to pain in later life. In my opinion, the reading of the paper is excellent and a great job has been done in its presentation. Apart from the meaning of some acronyms that are not clearly explained in the paper such as SM, it is the belief that the paper is of sufficient quality for publication.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract in the opinion of the reviewer has enough complexity.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The authors have presented scientifically sound approaches to the review based on the PICO strategy.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Olusayo Obajemu
Department, University & Country	University of Sheffield, United Kingdom