

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
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

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This study aims to investigate the level of heavy metals, aflatoxins, pesticides, and microbial content in herbal formulation Veppampoo Mathirai that may affect human health. The manuscript needs some revisions to improve scientific quality. An important limitation, which must be discussed in the manuscript, is that the work is based not on real samples (formulation Veppampoo Mathirai) but on spiked samples (as they mentioned "The medicine was prepared at pharmacology department"). It is not mentioned who is the real manufacturer of the final medicine (herbal formulation Veppampoo Mathirai) used for regulating of blood pressure.</p> <p>Comment 1: There are no data that confirms that the raw materials (procured from reputed indigenous raw drug store Chennai) used for preparing of the spiked formulation at pharmacology department are also procure from the same place (raw drug store Chennai) by the manufacturer of herbal formulation Veppampoo Mathirai.</p> <p>Comment 2: The abstract section should be improved. In the part Material and methods, it should be stated which methods were used for testing, for example AAS was used for testing of heavy metals, TLC was used for testing of aflatoxins and quantification was done by densitometry ...</p> <p>Part "Results". This part is starting with the sentence: "The results of this study demonstrated that heavy metals, as listed in Table 1 were found below the recommended limit as per AYUSH guidelines." Only the results should be presented in this section. Comments that results are in the recommended limits should be explain in the part "Discussion".</p> <p>Comment 3: The discussion section should be re-written. In this part, the obtained results for each parameter should be comment in relation to the reference values and referred to the guideline in which these values are prescribed.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Comment 4: The method by which pesticides are determined is not described (for example GC/MS or LC/MS/MS or other). From over 200 pesticides that should be tested (according to SANCO/12571/2013), only 10 are presented in this work. It is not stated based on what only these 10 pesticides were selected. All of them are BQL - below quantification limit. Numerical value for each pesticide for QL is not specified.</p> <p>Comment 5: There are no references for acceptance criteria for microbiological content</p> <p>Comment 6: There are no references based on which maximum limits for heavy metals are accepted</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>This study shows nothing significant. Bearing in mind that there is an AYUSH Pharmacopieal Laboratory of Indian Medicine Guidelines, this means that the product must meet these criteria before being placed on the market. So, fundings are expected considering that they procured the raw materials from a repute drug store.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kidly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Tijana Serafimovska</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Ss. Cyril and Methodius University, North Macedonia</i>