

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIMPS_128672
Title of the Manuscript:	Physicochemical characterization of cucurbita pepo L. (cucurbitaceae) seed oil obtained by cold organic extraction
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Any chemical identification and characterization do becomes an important step in identifying the potential of the compound. However, the process of identification is not only limited to basic quantitative characterization. It also requires evidences proving the qualitative characterization. For e.g., Even after separation of oil from cyclohexane, it seems to mention the intended oil colour should be "Greenish yellow" but from image we could see it is brown colour. It either still contains some part of cyclohexane or the extraction process has yielded another compound. And the confirmatory analysis of oil compounds has not been performed. Hence, it couldn't be claimed to have been purest yield of the batch.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Not really. The title states physicochemical characterization but the necessary analysis such as HPTLC seems to be missing which does not justify the evaluation process. Kindly think of another title if possible.	
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.	Repeated paragraph of abstract into introduction. Too much of Introduction with unnecessary points. Could cut short the introduction if possible	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	1)The oil as a whole contains many sub compounds which could have different physical or chemical properties. Instead of analysing whole oil, it could have been separated using column chromatography and tested its active to confirm its uses. 2) Results seems to be taken from another article rather than performing and derivation of results in house. If It is a research article, it is mandatory to mention your findings rather than taking the results from different sources. 3)Yield of oil seems incorrect as liquids are measured in ml not gms.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No, all references are upto requirements	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Little bit of language correction	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Sakshi Shetty
Department, University & Country	MET Institute Of Pharmacy, India