

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77275
Title of the Manuscript:	Heavy metals analysis and Estimation of Aflatoxin, pesticide residue, microbial content of Siddha poly herbal formulation Veppampoo Mathirai
Type of the Article	Original 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>

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<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>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b><u>In Materials and Methods section</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Needs clarity on whether the authors evaluated VeppampooMathirai (VPM) or the herbal ingredients separately.</li><li>2. Because authors state that they wanted to test VPM (not herbal ingredients of VPM) for its safety, if the authors have TESTED herbal ingredients separately they need to provide reasoning (in one sentence) for choosing to test the ingredients separately over VPM. Alternatively the authors should state that "they prepared VPM using the ingredients and then tested for different parameters, because certain toxins/microbes may get eliminated in the VPM preparation process. This makes the sentence as well as the methods more meaningful.</li><li>3. If the authors tested ingredients not VPM then they need to give the exact list of herbal ingredients in materials section (even if they have mentioned them in Introduction, atleast they should provide reference, by stating "ingredients tested were as mentioned above").</li><li>4. The authors could have tested different VPM formulations after obtaining VPM from different Siddha Vaidya.</li></ol> <p><b><u>In introduction section</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Authors need to provide reasoning for choosing to test the toxins of interest.</li><li>2. Need to give proper link between different aspects of the topics.</li></ol> <p><b><u>In discussion section</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Most sentences in written in discussion needs to be in Introduction.</li><li>2. Discussion section, is available to provide highlights between the results and their importance, to compare the results with any substantiating data. But authors have not included such highly essential explanations. Authors need to put effort in this direction.</li></ol> <p><b><u>In Conclusion section</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The results only suggests the safety of the current batch of VPM and not the entire VPM formulation available across the nation or the world. Because as the level of toxic metals, mycotoxins, pesticide and microbial contaminations depend on the source, the place from which the ingredients were obtained, season, etc.</li><li>2. Thus Conclusion needs refining.</li></ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Sentence needs to be checked for grammatical errors.</li></ol>	
<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>Prathapkumar Kothapalli</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>The University of Trans-Disciplinary, India</i></b>