

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_81039
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of Microwave Treatment and Pressure Cooker Methods for Antigen Retrieval Techniques In Immunohistochemistry
Type of the Article	Study Protocol

### 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>)

### **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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- It is not specified from the beginning (summary and introduction), of the text, which tissues of the biopsies will be studied (example: brain, organs, muscle), it is also not specified that all the treatment will be with the paraffin method</li><li>- In the abstract the conclusions must already be described</li><li>- The 30 cases described in the methodology do not specify whether they are experimental or controls.</li><li>- In the tissue preparation in step 1- is there perfusion and paraffinization? because in step 2 says that there is De-paraffinization process</li><li>- It is important that the results are reported with well-described images, since what is intended in this article is to compare both procedures for Antigen Retrieval and without the description of the results it is not possible to make this comparison.</li><li>- This study seems only the beginning of another that is planned, since there are no results or conclusions, it remains very ambiguous.</li></ul> <p>It does not have results to be able to compare both procedures, which is the objective from the title of the work.</p>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>Throughout the text, periods go after the references and not before them.</p>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<p>Many technical details are needed, such as describing what type of biopsies were used, the immunohistochemical steps should be better detailed and especially the results to be able to compare both methods, which is the objective of the work.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Erika María Orta Salazar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México</b>