

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77413
Title of the Manuscript:	Pharmacokinetic considerations in geriatric medication
Type of the 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Title is okay.- Abstract section writings are inappropriate. I suggest rewriting the abstract by adding a focus point.- State the objective of the study clearly in the abstract section.- Many sentences are grammatically problematic.- The abstract section can be improved by mentioning the significant findings.- Delete the redundant words throughout the whole manuscript.- Need to arrange the introduction section logically.- The introduction section is inapplicable. Try to include the recent literature based on geriatric medication.- The introduction section is inapplicable. Try to include the existing research limitations also, how the present research unravels those limits.- References in the materials and methods section is inappropriate.- Material and methods are written without appropriate references. Need a logical flow of the writings with sufficient references—the number of references used in materials and methods section also too few.- The results section is poorly written. It looks like preliminary writings.- The writing of results is also flawed. Need a logical flow of the writings.- The results section needs to be improved by adding significant results.- More explanation in the result section is required with subheadings.- Similarly, the results and discussion is feeble. Please, include the data from other sources about related works.- A sound discussion includes principal, relationship, and generalizations supported by the results.- In the discussion, many concepts already reported in the introduction are repeated, so it is better to avoid unnecessary repetitions.- Novelty of the author's work and recommendation should be added by the author in the conclusion section.	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Spacing, punctuation marks, grammar, and spelling errors should be reviewed thoroughly. I found so many typos throughout the manuscript.- English is modest. The authors need to develop their writing style. The whole manuscript needs to be checked by native English speakers.	
Optional/General comments	Although the article has scientific rigor, several major flows need to be improved before publication.	

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:	<i>Talha Bin Emran</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>BGC Trust University Bangladesh, Bangladesh</i>