

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JPRI_123688</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>PHYTOCHEMICAL SCREENING AND SAFETY OF A POLYHERBAL TEA BASED ON LIPPIA MULTIFLORA, ZINGIBER OFFICINALE AND MENTHA PIPERITA</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research article</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community as it contributes new insights and data to the field of study, potentially advancing current knowledge and inspiring further research. I appreciate the manuscript because it addresses a pertinent problem or knowledge gap, and the methodology is sound, providing robust results that can be replicated. Furthermore, the discussion is well-articulated, drawing logical conclusions based on the findings. While I value the contribution, I believe there may be areas where clarity could be improved, particularly in the explanation of certain complex concepts.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes the title is suitable</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p><b>Yes it is comprehensive but need to elobarate the discussion part</b></p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p><b>No the subsections are not appropriate</b>, conclusion is weak, strengthen it by focusing on the implications of the findings for future research or practical applications.</p>	
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound because it follows a systematic approach to the research problem, ensuring that each step of the methodology is clearly outlined and reproducible. The use of appropriate statistical analysis strengthens the validity of the findings, providing confidence in the results. The research is built on a solid foundation of prior studies, demonstrating a good understanding of the field, and the conclusions are well-supported by the data presented. Overall, the scientific reasoning is logical, and the methodology is well-aligned with the study's objectives.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> =</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript appear to be mostly sufficient, covering key studies relevant to the topic. However, there is a need to include more recent publications to reflect the latest advancements in the field, as a significant portion of the references are more than five years old. I recommend including studies from the past three years to ensure that the manuscript is aligned with the most current research trends. Additionally, if there are groundbreaking papers or reviews published recently on the specific methodologies or subject areas covered in this work, those should be incorporated to strengthen the relevance of the literature review.</p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language and English quality of the article are mostly suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript is generally clear, but there are a few areas where minor revisions could improve readability and fluency. Some sentences could be restructured for better clarity, and a few technical terms might benefit from more precise explanations to enhance understanding for a broader scientific audience. A thorough proofreading for grammatical consistency and smoother phrasing would be beneficial to ensure the article meets the highest standards of academic writing.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript presents a well-structured and insightful study with clear objectives and a strong scientific foundation. The methodology is sound, and the results are interpreted effectively. However, there are some areas where clarity can be improved, especially in the explanation of complex concepts. The language, while adequate, could be refined for smoother readability and flow. Additionally, incorporating a few more recent references would further strengthen the literature review. Overall, this is a valuable contribution to the field and could benefit from minor revisions to enhance its impact.	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>Ch K V L S N Anjana Male</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Nims University, India</b>