



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_30703
Title of the Manuscript:	Potentials of Plant Oils in Pruritus Alleviation
Type of the Article	Review paper

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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	I believe that "current understanding" should be summarized in the last 10 years, not after 1991.	Agreed and corrected
	I recommend excluding the books as a source of search for the methodology, since they are about the synthesis of articles. It should be taken into account when used primary source.	Agreed and corrected. For the ease of reviewing, the authors have added <i>Table 2. Retrieved articles serving as direct sources of analysis</i> in the manuscript.
	I suggest incorporating into the methodology more elements to justify the inclusion of a study, for example, methodological quality of the manuscript.	The second inclusion criterion, when interpreted further, requires the examined oil to have a similar mechanism to one of the four categories, which in itself is quite a narrow criterion because not so many researchers consider plant oils as an antipruritic agent exerting listed activities. This leads to a small number of pertinent literature and incorporating more elements would possibly eliminate potentially related articles.
	I believe that the inclusion of more randomized clinical trials or systematic reviews can better support the clinical evidence for the use of plant oils.	The review's structure is based on B. Elmaria's work, in which synthetic antipruritic drugs were categorized according to their working mechanism. By classifying plant oils accordingly, the authors offer a novel approach to itch alleviation concerning natural medicine. It follows that few clinical trials or systematic reviews would be retrieved since not so many researchers take the approach and conduct such studies.
	Authors' correct name: reference 33 - Sousa DG, Sousa SDG, Silva RER, Silva-Alves KS, Ferreira-da-Silva FW, Kerntopf MR et al.	Agreed and corrected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	References 7, 8, 29, 36, 42 are prior to the date proposed in the methodology!	About references 7, 29: the authors mistook the intended articles with the other similar two while citing the references. About reference 8: there was a technical mistake using the reference citing tool. The article was first published in December 1991. About references 36, 42: their published years, respectively, are 1995 and 2008.
	Plagiarism Issue- The text "Pruritus, or itch, is commonly defined as an "unpleasant sensation that elicits the desire or reflex to 11 scratch" [1]" is very similar to the original!	The authors intended to repeat the definition and preserve originality by placing the phrase in quotation mark, followed by a citation.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	I suggest working with a shorter period of time (maximum 10 years), searching to identify in the literature studies with a better level of evidence.	With a limitation in database access and the already scarce body of literature in the field, the authors are afraid that limiting the period of time would affect the well-roundedness of the review.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The article brings an interesting review on the treatment of pruritus, however, it would be appropriate to incorporate more robust and current scientific evidence. As a suggestion, perhaps, limit and extend the discussion in substances that have better scientific evidence for its clinical application.	All changes have been made. Thank you for your time.