

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80521
Title of the Manuscript:	A brief study on Trichomonas Vaginalis
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:

<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>The document is good, however several comments are made hoping to improve the writing.</p> <p>Once the writing has been reviewed, it is necessary for the authors to consider several details that are shown in color, this because it presents errors in writing, syntax, spelling, and style.</p> <p>It shows various inconsistencies in its writing and sequence of what is intended, in addition they result in several sections, and the adequate or more correct use of medical terms, as well as in the structure and coherence of the document.</p>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>It is necessary to conceptualize the subject while waiting for the knowledge to be shared to be structured and written in a correct and understandable way (several paragraphs of the work are confusing).</p> <p>Two summaries appear in the document (at the beginning and at the end, which is illogical); and the conclusions must be the result of the analysis that was carried out when dealing with a revision, so they must be rewritten.</p>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<p>It is suggested to review the wording and consistency of the different sections (avoid repeating information or data); since grammatical, writing and syntax errors are observed; The figures presented are not considered within the paragraphs (which guide to know what is intended); as well as errors in the citation form of each of the paragraphs, the style and correct writing of all the references used (some are missing data; and in others there is data that should not appear).</p> <p>Check the correct form of the references, both in each of the paragraphs, and at the end of the reference list, respecting the style and recommendations of the journal.</p> <p>References must be listed at the end of the manuscript and numbered in the order that they appear in the text. Every reference referred in the text must also present in the reference list and vice versa. In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets [5].</p> <p>All references should follow the following style. Reference to a journal:                      1. Hilly M, Adams ML, Nelson SC. A study of digit fusion in the mouse embryo. Clin Exp Allergy. 2002;32(4):489-498.</p> <p>Reference to a book:                      5. Rang HP, Dale MM, Ritter JM, Moore PK. Pharmacology. 5th ed. Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone; 2003.</p>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Review Form 1.6**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Benjamin Valladares Carranza</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Autonomous University of Mexico State, Mexico</b>