

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_79174
Title of the Manuscript:	An efficient synthesis of Anti-spasmodic drug Mebeverine hydrochloride
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:

(<https://www.journalpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Comment #1: "Key words" should be written as "Keywords"; the phrase "which causes spasm" should be written as "which causes spasms". Also, "There is a great demand for both development" as "There is a great demand for both developments". Many more grammatical and typographical errors are scattered within the manuscript. Please revise accordingly.</p> <p>Comment #2: This manuscript requires careful enhancement in the English Language quality because its present form is very poor and lacks standard for Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International. For instance., "The development of thee step method." makes no sense.</p> <p>Comment #3: Table 1: experiments with different volumes; If 5% use of the dimer resulted in higher yield, I expected the authors to try lower %. Why was this ignored by the authors?</p> <p>Comment #4: What is the novelty of your work?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Comment #1: "Key words" should be written as "Keywords"; the phrase "which causes spasm" should be written as "which causes spasms". Also, "There is a great demand for both development" as "There is a great demand for both developments". Many more grammatical and typographical errors are scattered within the manuscript. Please revise accordingly.</p> <p>Comment #2: This manuscript requires careful enhancement in the English Language quality because its present form is very poor and lacks standard for Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International. For instance., "The development of thee step method." makes no sense.</p> <p>Comment #3: Table 1: experiments with different volumes; If 5% use of the dimer resulted in higher yield, I expected the authors to try lower %. Why was this ignored by the authors?</p> <p>Comment #4: What is the novelty of your work?</p>	
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jonathan Tersur Orasugh
Department, University & Country	University of Johannesburg, South Africa