

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77822
Title of the Manuscript:	DETERMINATION OF TERPENOID PROFILE IN DRY CANNABIS FLOWERS AND EXTRACTS OBTAINED FROM DIFFERENT CANNABIS VARIETES
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abstract: Rephrase the sentences in "Results" – they are difficult to understand. Parts of the "Conclusions" would be better found in the introduction. • The manuscript will benefit significantly from correction by a native English speaker. • Fig. 1-1: Axis labels are missing and values are almost unreadable (too small) • Tab. 3: Retention time dimension is missing (s ?) • Tab. 4: Dimensions missing! • Fig. 2 is meaningless when no Terpenes are indicated. • Discussion as well as conclusion contains several sentences in the beginning of each which belong to the introduction or to the aim respectively. • Give percentage of terpene reduction in the conclusions. • Repeatability is mentioned and repletion rates are given. However, I couldn't find any standard deviations in the manuscript. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is it Cannabis sativa L. really overall the most frequently used plant? I can't believe that. Reference? ○ A reference for Linalool is missing. ○ ... was to develop or verify the GC / MS method for determination of 35 terpenes... - Did you develop a method or did you validate an existing one, or die you develop and validate it? Pleas be more accurate in phrasing. 	
Optional/General comments	<p>The manuscript presents a comprehensive study on Terpene determination in Cannabis samples and on the decrease of concentrations from the dry flowers converted into decarboxylated oil and distilled oil. However, there are several significant drawbacks throughout the article which require major revision.</p> <p>In general, a clear structure and statements with regard to the aim of the study and which results have been obtained is missing. The conclusions in the abstract should present the results, underpinned by numbers. Presently, there are many phrases which beklong to the introduction/aim. It should be made clear right in the abstract, that a proposed analytical method was used to quantify Terpenes in the samples in order to show the reduction during the different processes for THC concentration.</p>	

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, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wolfgang Vautz
Department, University & Country	Germany