



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 (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	I believe that "current understanding" should be summarized in the last 10 years, not after 1991. 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. I suggest incorporating into the methodology more elements to justify the inclusion of a study, for example, methodological quality of the manuscript. 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. Authors' correct name: reference 33 - Sousa DG, Sousa SDG, Silva RER, Silva-Alves KS , Ferreira-da-Silva FW, Kerntopf MR et al. References 7, 8, 29, 36, 42 are prior to the date proposed in the methodology! 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!	
Minor 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.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<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.	
---	---	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Michel Marcos Dalmedico</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Nursing, Positivo University, Brazil</i>