

Review Form 3

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

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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>
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.	I like this manuscript for the following reasons; 1. Phytochemical screening is very important in determining the composition of natural products, as the therapeutic activities of natural products are associated with these bioactive compounds. This research therefore identified the various phytochemicals present in the polyhebal tea. 2. Safety assessment of natural products including tea is very relevant, since this ensures that products being consumed do not cause any harm or the harm caused is minimal. 3. Findings from this work will pave way for other future work which may focus on the assessment of therapeutic effects of this polyherbal tea.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title should be changed to "PHYTOCHEMICAL SCREENING AND SAFETY ASSESSMENT OF A POLYHERBAL TEA FORMULATION OF LIPPIA MULTIFLORA, ZINGER OFFICINALE AND MENTHA PIPERITA".	

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>Aims:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Lippia multiflora</i>, <i>Zingiber officinale</i>, and <i>Mentha piperita</i> (and should not be italicized) 2. This study aims at determining the phytochemical composition and evaluating the safety of a tea made from them for safe human consumption (This sentence re-construction should be effected). <p>The methodology of the abstract should be written as; For tea formulations, powder of each plant was prepared and weighed in specific proportions to formulate five different polyherbal tea. A hedonic test was then conducted on each formulation to evaluate consumer appreciation. Phytochemical composition was carried out by coloration and precipitation tests. This was followed by acute and subacute toxicity tests.</p> <p>The following additions should be made to the methodology of the abstract;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The various doses for the polyherbal tea formulation should be captured in the methodology of the abstract 2. The various phytochemicals screened should be included in the methodology of the abstract. 3. The parameters considered for safety assessment should be briefly mentioned in the methodology of the abstract. 4. The number of animals per group for the safety assessment should be stated. 5. The methodology of the abstract should also state the statistical significance used for data analyses (the p value used) 6. The methodology of the abstract should include the sample size for the hedonic test. <p>The following comments are associated with the results of the abstract;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The author (s) only stated the safety of formulation 4. However, there was no mention of the safety of the other formulations. Why is the focus on only Tea formulation 4? 2. There are grammatical errors. This correction should be effected, Subacute toxicity tests showed that the polyherbal tea has no adverse effects on biochemical parameters. <p>Conclusion of abstract: This correction should be effected (grammatical error) The polyherbal tea 4 which was the most appreciated, was rich in secondary metabolites such as..... and was not toxic to wistar rats.</p> <p><i>Lippia multiflora</i>, <i>Zingiber officinale</i> and <i>Mentha piperita</i> should be added to the keywords.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections lack a section for Ethical Approval. This section is very relevant because this study involved the use of laboratory animals as well as human subjects. Also, the methodology did not make mention of ethical approval. This is against research ethics.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Haematological indices and biochemical parameters are good indicators for toxicity assessment, as these parameters are sensitive to toxicants. Therefore, the use of these parameters is appropriate. 2. Trends in body weights over a period of time are also good indicators of toxicity assessment. This is appropriately used. 3. The use of Harborne methods for phytochemical screening is appropriate. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>The following external references are incomplete/need amendments;</p> <p>Reference 2 – No volume and issue numbers, no page numbers. Reference 3- No volume and issue numbers, no page numbers Reference 4- No volume and issue numbers, no page numbers Reference 5- No name of journal, No volume and issue numbers, no page numbers Reference 6- - No volume and issue numbers, no page numbers Reference 7- Journal name not italicized Reference 9- Journal name not italicized</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>Reference 10- Journal name not italicized Reference 12 - Journal name not italicized, No volume and issue numbers, no page numbers Reference 13-Journal name not italicized, No volume and issue numbers, no page numbers Reference 14-- Journal name not italicized Reference 15- Journal name not italicized Reference 16- Journal name not italicized Reference 17- No page numbers Reference 18- Journal name not italicized Reference 23- Journal name not italicized Reference 24, 25 and 26 – No edition and page number (s) Reference 28- Journal name not italicized Reference 29- No edition and page number (s) Reference 30 - Journal name not italicized Reference 31- No edition and page number (s) Reference 32- No edition and page number (s) Reference 33 - No edition and page number (s) Reference 34- Journal name not italicized Reference 36 - Journal name not italicized Reference 39- Journal name not italicized Reference 40- Journal name not italicized Reference 41- Journal name not italicized Reference 42- Journal name not italicized</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The introductory session of the main introduction is grammatically incorrect. The conclusion section of the main introduction is grammatically incorrect.</p> <p>The article has many grammatical errors.The author(s) should read the whole article to correct grammatical errors/ sentence re-construction.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The author (s) should explain why the focus was on only Tea formulation 4</p> <p>Plant parts should replace plant organs. Section 1.2 should be written as Animals, instead of animal materials. The search for should be replaced with the presence for Red cell should be replaced with Red blood cell The p value used for each result should be stated in the description of each figure Results: Section 1.4 Chemical Screening should be replaced with Phytochemical screening</p> <p>The results for the phytochemical screening do not indicate the concentration of each phytochemical. This can be predicted from the colour for each test. For example += Present, += Present in moderate concentration, +++=Present in high concentration.</p> <p>The alignments are not appropriate</p> <p>The data in the hedonic test (Histograms) should be approximated to 2 decimal places.</p> <p>The discussion should be re-written to explain the results.</p> <p>Yes, there are ethical issues. This study involved the use of laboratory animals as well as human subjects, hence needs ethical approval. The omission of ethical approval or clearance is against research ethics.</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Richard Sedeavor
Department, University & Country	Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana