

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77881
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTI INFLAMMATORY ACTIVITY OF HERBAL FORMULATION PREPARED USING MINT AND GREEN TEA
Type of the 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>This study investigated the anti-inflammatory potential of green tea and mint dried powder water infusion. The abstract is the repetition of other sections of the manuscript. Therefore, authors are requested to re-write the abstract. The material and method section explains the infusion preparation and only BSA was used to study the anti-inflammatory activity. Further, proper statistical analysis was not performed to validate the results. The use of the English language in the introduction part is impressive whereas the results and discussion part were not described well. The introduction part discussed irrelevant materials to the topic. Therefore, the authors are requested to re-write a concise introduction avoiding matters which are out of the scope of this study. The authors failed to discuss similar findings of other research in the discussion part. Re-write the conclusion very concisely and avoid adjective words like 'great'. The self-promotion of your work without an absolute need should be voided to maintain a good scientific practice. Also, strictly avoid any write-up which discloses the identity of the authors directly or indirectly. Overall, the amount of work described in this study was insufficient to publish as a single journal paper. Therefore, the authors are encouraged to add more work to the manuscript, for example, different sample preparation methods, extraction methods or treatments. Considering all these, I recommended this manuscript has to be go through major revision.</p> <p><b>Introduction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The whole introduction part is written as a single paragraph. Break it into 3-4 paragraphs in a meaningful way.</li> <li>• Although this part is written well, there is no cohesiveness in the write-up. Narrate the introduction story in a logical flow to attract the reader to read it.</li> <li>• The sentences in a paragraph have to be arranged in a way to narrate a story (see annotated manuscript).</li> <li>• Remove unnecessary sentences. The introduction has to be concise (e.g – the application of green tea can be written in a single sentence).</li> <li>• The research gap was not identified or clearly defined.</li> </ul> <p><b>Materials and methods</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The statistical analysis part is missing in this study.</li> <li>• Mean separation has to be performed to differentiate the significance in results.</li> <li>• Reference for the extraction of leaf infusion is not mentioned.</li> <li>• Control in anti-inflammatory activity is not mentioned.</li> </ul> <p><b>Results and discussion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference for anti-inflammatory activity assay is not discussed.</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Results and discussion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The authors failed to discuss the results with similar finds in the literature.</li> <li>• The mechanism behind the anti-inflammatory action is not explained.</li> </ul>	

## Review Form 1.6

<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Avoid personal pronouns in scientific writing (eg – my study needs to be changed as this study)</li><li>• Punctuation marks and spaces are not followed appropriately. This could be due to the transformation of the manuscript to different versions of the word processor</li></ul>	
----------------------------------	--	--

### **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>Gunaratnam Abhiram</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Uva Wellassa University, Sri Lanka</b>