

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_79612
Title of the Manuscript:	Role Of Forensic Anthropology in Disaster Victim Identification (DVI)
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.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>The review article on Disaster Victim Identification and the role of anthropology in the process is written in grammatically correct English, follows a logical order of narration, is easy to read, provides essential facts and may be successfully utilized as an introductory source in education. It consists of total 11 pages, including the list of 26 references. The Abstract section is not structured but it mirrors the main information contained in the article.</p> <p>The structure of the text is convoluted - not following strictly the standard accepted widely among scientific journals (introduction, material and methods, results, discussion, conclusion); there are too many sections and their headers which may cause confusion in the Readers.</p> <p>The main issue with the text is that its topic does not fully fit into the scope of topics raised in the Journal - as there is only, if any, a marginal mention of pharmaceutical scientific problems in the article; therefore it shall be considered if it would not be advisable to pass it for publication in some more topic-adjusted Journal.</p> <p>The use of references needs to be improved - it is not an acceptable practice to support one statement with numerous references without pointing at what each of this sources adds to the merit (e.c. "...for long term sampling [1],[2],[3],[4],[5].", "...mortality[7],[8],[9],[10].")</p> <p>There are total 26 scientific sources on the references list but the Authors used in the text only the sources numbered from 1 to 20. The rest of the sources seems to be lacking any references in the article.</p>	<p>Dear Editor,</p> <p>I did corrections as per your suggestions. Thank you for review my paper.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	