

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77593
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative physiochemical analysis of Kachi ghani, solvent oil and refined oil extracted from Brassica nigra
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>1. Clarify the term "solvent oil". Is it unrefined oil? It is not edible and is described in the text as the intermediate product in the refined oil obtaining. Is it necessary to carry out its analysis along with finished products (kachi ghani and refined oil)?</p> <p>2. Materials and methodology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All formulas should be presented in the form of mathematical formulas with a description of the operators used ($v = \frac{N}{N_1}$, where V – volume...) Why did You choose these methods to analyze the quality of the objects? Are they pharmacopoeial? In color determination the method is not specified, only the equipment Replace the chemical formulas with the names of the substances used: $AgNO_3$ - silver nitrate. If you use the solution, than specify it and be sure to indicate the concentration used: 25 ml of ammonium sulphate 25 ml of 10 % ammonium sulphate solution or else <p>3. Results and discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are a lot of information about each indicator and methods – this information should be put in Materials and methodology part. Why are there the information about the findings of other authors? There is no comparison between the results obtained and their findings. Literature overview should be summarised. Check the order of the given figures: fig. 2 is described in the text before fig. 1. Why do you describe <i>Agremone maxicana</i> if it is found in Mexico and the article is concerned of Indian species? Figures of the chromatograms should be put together as they present the results of 1 method. <p>4. The Given conclusion is not clear. What was the main purpose of the obtained comparison analysis? How did it differ from the findings of the other authors? How can these results be interpreted for the future research? Consider revising.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1. Grammar and spelling revision: Physiochemical – physicochemical or physical and chemical comparative analyze – analysis etc.</p> <p>2. Many capital letters in the same terms.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>1. Kachi ghani is the specific name of the substance, more related to the food industry. Maybe, in the name of the article it is better to specify the pharmacopoeial name only?</p> <p>2. Several references are older than 10 years. Maybe, they can be replaced with more recent literature.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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:	<i>Kateryna Semchenko</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>National University of Pharmacy, Ukraine</i>