

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_105290
Title of the Manuscript:	PHYSICOCHEMICAL EVALUATION OF A TOOTHPASTE INCORPORATED WITH BRAZILIAN RED PROPOLIS
Type of the Article	Research

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://journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Not sufficient</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Grammatical and typo errors need to be rectified like gentivitis for gingivitis</p> <p>2. The pH of the toothpaste formulation was alkaline in nature but the authors calibrated the instrument only for acidic and neutral pH</p> <p>3. HPLC analysis was used to study the chemical constituents but there is no sufficient data available in the manuscript for HPLC analysis. Fig. 2 is mentioned as HPLC analysis but it seems like a overlay UV spectra.</p> <p>4. No data about antimicrobial activity has been mentioned in the manuscript.</p> <p>5. Except pH and mass variation other physicochemical properties are not studied much</p> <p>6. Recent References need after the year 2020 to be updated in the bibliography.</p> <p>7. In table and manuscript body no legends are mentioned like what D90 stands for?</p> <p>8. No statistical correlation is observed in the tables.</p> <p>9. Overall the manuscript is weakly drafted with meagre data.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	S. Vijayaraj
Department, University & Country	Dr. Kalam College of Pharmacy, India