

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_76569
Title of the Manuscript:	Measuring prescription pattern of nutraceuticals with special focus on Protein Supplements in Tier-1 Indian City.
Type of the Article	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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Introduction</b> The introduction is too long. Also, some information contrasts with others. Indeed, the article cites only food sources used as nutraceuticals. What about non-food sources then? What is the Difference Between Dietary Fiber and Functional Fiber?</p> <p><b>Results</b> The results do not give us any information on the number of doctors working in rural or urban areas. These results should be divided into two distinct parts: one corresponding to the answers of the doctors and the other to that of the chemists. Finally, the results mentioned in the text must also appear in the tables or figures.</p> <p>All tables should show the number of different parameters before mentioning the %. Figure 1 shows response data from 94 patients. Where does this number come from? Some senphrases mentioned in the results should be used for discussion.</p> <p><b>Discussion</b> Some statements are not linked to the results obtained</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b> The conclusion is poorly worded. The salient results are not highlighted.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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><i>Yepie Audrey Herbert</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Nangui Abrogoua University, Côte d'Ivoire</i></b>