Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_80522**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Black Plague: History and Analysis**
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

	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	The research team made an attempt to summarize the scientific achievements and the importance of knowledge of the history and analysis of Black Plague evolution during it's pandemic. Their effort is commendable, but the resulted manuscript not meet the criterion of a possible acceptance in the prestigious Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International, mainly from the following reasons: - in the Abstract section only general information are presented, without any reference to the study aim, and without to explain how these were met, together with the lacking of the summary informative presentation of main findings, interesting hypothesis or any other information to increase the reader's interest; The biggest problem of this "review", is its structure – beside abstract and few references, presently comprise only two chapters: introduction and discussion. The materials and methods section completely missing. I wonder, why? In case of reviews this chapter is constitute the cornerstone. Here, the authors should have specified the selection strategy of the scientific papers or any other published material which the authors consulted during the elaboration of this material, how these manuscripts, as raw data, have been processed, resulting in an unclear selection strategy of the articles presented in the reference list. - Here I can mention the possible tables summarizing the results of raw processing data, graphical abstracts, or any other informative material. In its present form this review seems to be a simply - during data presentation the scientific style is confused, consisting in frequently alternating between the using of the simply present, past tense (i.e., samples were found) and present perfect (i.e., samples have been found) - the Conclusion section it's a little informative, without to highlighting a concise and understandable conclusion, how the summarized results improve the known solution in this study area? What new knowledge you give with your results? What is the weak part of the present review? How your research will be continued? there Is still a certain perspective or open question in this field? The reference list is not uniformly elaborated, and is not in agreement with the journal requirement. Last, but not least I would encourage the authors to taking in consideration the all critiques and suggestions.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Kálmán Imre**
Department, University & Country	**Banat's University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine "King Michael I of Romania", Romania**