

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77058
Title of the Manuscript:	Morphometric study of cadaveric Spleen in Vidarbha region
Type of the Article	Original Research 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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The authors report a cadaveric study of morphological variations of spleen. It is a very superficial study with only 60 spleens studied from cadavers have been used and percentage statistics have been presented.</p> <p>The manuscript is not acceptable in the present form due to the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Manuscript has many grammatical errors. They have to be corrected. 2. In figure 2, whatever has been labelled as lower border is actually the upper border. So it has to be given as the notches in the upper border. 3. Photographs of spleens of various shapes have to be given 4. Following articles may be cited Nayak SB, Shetty P, R D, Sirasanagandla SR, Shetty SD. A lobulated spleen with multiple fissures and hila. J Clin Diagn Res. 2014 Sep;8(9):AD01-2. doi: 10.7860/JCDR/2014/8996.4774. Epub 2014 Sep 20. PMID: 25386417; PMCID: PMC4225869. Satheesha Nayak B*, Vasanth Kumar, Naveen Kumar and Raghu Jetti. Unusual fissure on the diaphragmatic surface of the spleen – a case report. International Journal of Anatomical Variations (2012) 5: 96–98 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	Satheesha Nayak B
Department, University & Country	Manipal Academy of Higher Education, India