

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JPRI_97070 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Comparative quality analysis of three marketed melatonin containing products in Spain for the improvement of sleep onset, sleep maintenance and sleep quality. |
| Type of the Article | Original 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) |
|---|--|---|
| 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) | Yes, your topic is interesting especially in the context where the supplements are not well regulated in most the countri In my opinion the title of the research is too long, the last part is not necessary In the abstract more concrete data can be introduced yes yes although you used USP, it is not included in the bibliography for the HPLC method, you did not specify the working method, found (mg) (Mean±SD), recovery RSDa (%), confidence interval | |
| Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | English could be improved | |
| Optional/General comments | | |

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: | Tatarina Gabriela |
| Department, University & Country | University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Romania |