

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_96351
Title of the Manuscript:	Kinetic spectrophotometric determination of ascorbic acid by using phenanthroline agent in Eruca sativum
Type of the Article	Research 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

	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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p> <p>Yes No, should include kinetic parameters. No, Results and discussion should include more subsections which may include validation, optimisation assay etc., Complete scientific data is not provided Could have included Some kinetic spectrophotometric methods in results and discussion section. The manuscript shows major revisions with regard to</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Few tables and graphs were presented. To support the research work more supporting data in the form tables and figures need to be provided.</li> <li>2. Analytical parameters were not provided.</li> <li>3. Which kinetic study is adopted and present the data for the kinetic study and the formula used to study.</li> <li>4. Optimisation of extraction procedure for separation of ascorbic acid using acetic acid and meta phosphoric acid was not provided.</li> <li>5. Validation procedure and data are missing</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Language is suitable for scholarly communication</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 1.7**

**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>R. Vijayalakshmi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>GIET School of Pharmacy, India</b>