

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_97805
Title of the Manuscript:	THE EFFECT OF HEAVY METAL CONTAMINANTS IN SOME HERBAL COSMETICS ON LIPID PROFILE AND CARDIOVASCULAR RISK INDICES OF RABBITS.
Type of the Article	Original 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.journaljamps.com/index.php/JAMPS/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	I feel the manuscript addresses an important concern with respect to selected herbal cosmetics. If true, then it significantly contributes to society at large Change of the title is required. It should be concise. Results section should contain data. Structure and subsections of the manuscript are appropriate. I don't have expertise in checking the methodology followed and the animal studies. However, I feel to check the biochemical parameters, there is no necessary of animals to be sacrificed. References are found to be recent. However, a few more references pertaining to similar studies would have been included.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript should undergo copyediting	
Optional/General comments	There is a confusion in the number of rabbits used. 60/64/40?	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	D Sreedhar
Department, University & Country	Manipal College of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Manipal Academy of Higher Education, India