



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_67580
Title of the Manuscript:	CIRCULATORY GST STATUS OF ALCOHOLICS ATTENDING URBAN HEALTH TRAINING CENTRE AND RURAL HEALTH TRAINING CENTRE, SMHRC, NAGPUR
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1th I felt the lack of a paragraph right at the introduction of the article arguing the relevance of the research. Missed to explain in the introduction section what scientific and social contributions this research brings. Therefore, I recommend that the author make at least one paragraph in the introduction justifying the performance of this review, exposing these points.</p> <p>2th I recommend that the authors write in the introduction a paragraph presenting the question that gave rise to this scientific investigation. Still in the introduction, the authors must present the purpose of the study. I encourage the main question that gave rise to the study to be presented right on the introduction of this scientific article.</p> <p>3th As well, in the introduction it is necessary to expose in a paragraph a synthesis of the methodology used in the research.</p> <p>4th I felt the lack of a systematic review of the literature to situate the reader on the subject of the scientific article. Therefore, to improve the quality of the manuscript, I recommend that the authors make a brief systematic review of the literature. In order to situate the reader on the central theme of the article, I recommend that in the manuscript the systematic review of the literature be presented before the methodology session.</p> <p>5th With all the discussion held throughout the manuscript, the conclusions section is limited to just a small paragraph, this is a very negative point. To improve the quality of the manuscript I recommend that the author have a broader discussion in the concluding section! The conclusion section is the final part of the research. In this section, the author should perform a synthesis of the elements contained in the text of the work, joining ideas and closing the questions presented in the introduction of the work. In the concluding section, the author must answer whether the research has solved the problem, initially proposed, whether it has broadened understanding about it or whether other problems have been discovered. The author should also clarify whether the hypotheses raised at the beginning were confirmed or refuted, whether the general and specific objectives were achieved, whether the methodology used was sufficient to carry out the procedures, whether the bibliography corresponded to expectations, in addition to demonstrating , also, its position on the theme, after reading, analyzing, comparing and synthesizing different authors about it. In the concluding section, the author must give suggestions and recommendations on how to deal with the problem studied. Therefore, I encourage the author to rewrite the concluding section by structuring it as follows: Respond if the research solved the proposed problem, if it expanded the understanding of the problem or if new problems were discovered; Respond if the hypotheses raised were confirmed or disproved; Respond if general and specific objectives have been achieved; Respond if the methodology used was sufficient to carry out the procedures; Respond if the referenced biography lived up to expectations; And give suggestions and recommendations on how to deal with the problem studied. The author should start the first paragraph the concluding section by making a brief general summary of the topic and of what was analyzed in the development of the article;</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Importance: explain the importance of the topic for the academic environment, for society in general and for yourself;</p> <p>Results: this is the main objective of the final considerations in the section concluding the article, to gather and clarify the main results. Use simple and clear language;</p> <p>Objectives: review the objectives of the work one by one, checking whether they have been achieved or not and describing their impact on the results of the work;</p> <p>Difficulties and limitations: report what were the difficulties encountered (short term, restricted topic, scarcity of resources, etc.) and limitations (insufficient data collection, etc.);</p> <p>Improvements: at the end of the work there are always open questions or an objective not reached and new questions may also have arisen. So recognize the weaknesses of your monograph and outline future situations, with the possibility of an evolution of research in a future graduate program;</p> <p>Justification: strengthen the final considerations of the scientific article showing the importance of the results obtained. Every job brings some kind of knowledge, even when the objectives do not reach the expected results.</p> <p>Close the concluding section by showing that the overall research objective has been achieved. Make suggestions for future research exposing the gaps that were found in the studies analyzed in the research path.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	The research topic is interesting, however, it needs a deep revision in its structure so that it can be published in a scientific journal.	
Optional/General comments	The research topic is interesting, pertinent, it is an article on a current topic that deserves attention by researchers in the clinical field.	

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>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Eduardo Mendes Medeiros
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal Do Ceará, Brasil