Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_83281**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Recent Advancements In Gibberellic Acid Formulation Techniques.**
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)

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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)*
1. Abstract	The abstract of the manuscript should be revised in a way that contain the relevant information of the paper in a concise and clear way. It is shallow and incomplete and is not the short form of the whole paper. Even the objective of the review should be indicated on the end of the abstract. **For further information please look at the comments written on manuscript.**	
2. Introduction	The introduction part of the paper should be revised according to the comments given on the paper. It lacks the background information and needs rearrangement of sentences.it will be better if some introductory ideas on the information contained on the main chapter specially chapter two are included. The sub-titles under this chapter are not related with the title of the paper. Additionally at the end of the introduction objective of the review is necessary either in sentence or whatever way you like. **For further information please look at the comments written on manuscript.**	
2. Main body	The main body is not well written as it is a review paper. Even the information under the sub-titles is not detail to say it is a real review. Better if each of the formulation and biosynthesis methods of GA3 are supported with sufficient sources. Generally, the paper lacks detail information and justification how the different methods of formulation work on**. For further information please look at the comments written on manuscript.**	

3.	The third chapter is not related with title of the paper at all and if you want it, please look the comments given on the main manuscript and try to modify it according to the comment given.	
4. Title of the paper	The title of the paper shall be modified based on the comments given on the main document. I am enforced to write this comment after reading the whole paper. In my opinion the title is not representative of the information given on the titles and sub-titles	
Minor REVISION comments	There are some technical issues indicated on the paper like punctuation and grammar	
Optional/General comments **Citations**	One of the qualities of a review paper is availability of sufficient evidence for the written paragraphs. Some paragraphs have no source in this paper, so please support with the relevant source. **For further information please look at the comments written on manuscript.**	

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)* Yes, there is ethical issues on the sources used both on the introduction and main part. It is a review paper and should be supported by different sources. Most of the programs under each title and sub=titles lack sufficient source or supported by only one or two sources which are directly taken.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Endalkachew Baye**
Department, University & Country	**Salale University, Ethiopia**