

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77346
Title of the Manuscript:	Epidemiology, Evaluation and Management of Wilson Disease; Review Article
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:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

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>Dear thanks for the opportunity to contribute to this article! My suggestions are below:</p> <p>Abstract topic - need to put keywords. Need to organize the abstract - put the research objective, methodology. At Conclusion - indicate that it is the conclusion (for example, completed, as a conclusion...) At the end of the abstract ("... we will be discussing the prevalence of the disease...") put the tense in the past because the research has already been done.</p> <p>Topics were missing from the manuscript: objective, methodology (how the research was carried out, which databases, the criteria for choosing the scientific material that was used...)</p> <p>Topic D-penicillamine (kerate): this part "During treatment with D-penicillamine, the...." where this information came from, is not quoted (same as in the trientine topic). Note 1: I suggest in the text preceding the topics D-penicillamine, trientine, ammonium and liver transplantation - that these are the therapies used. These topics are present in the treatment, but they were not mentioned to be the types of treatments used.</p> <p>Note 2: As early detection is critical for initiation of therapy and molecular diagnosis is used to detect the various mutations involved. I suggest making a topic about mutations involved with WD and describing the molecular tests used in this case.</p> <p>Note 3: I suggest improving the research conclusion, for example, when talking about early diagnosis, mentioning the mutation detection process through molecular biology techniques.</p> <p>Quotes: The citation numbers 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 13 are missing from the text. I suggest reviewing the citations because in the reference list there are 41 citations. I suggest putting them all in the text.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Place the citation before the end of each paragraph (leave it this way if it is the journal's own norms).</p> <p>Normally, topics are not made using a single citation. Improve topics in this condition for example: etiology, treatment...</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>It's a beautiful job, you just need to make some adjustments!</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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:	Cleide Barbieri de Souza
Department, University & Country	Lusiada University Center – Unilus Santos- Sao Paulo, Brazil