

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77939
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTI INFLAMMATORY AND ANTIOXIDANT ACTIVITY OF STEVIA AND PEPPERMINT HERBAL FORMULATION
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>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The introduction is not focused and suggests rewriting.2. The use of references is most of the time inappropriate and irrelevant references have been included in several times. Suggest using references appropriately. Several books have been referred and given the inappropriateness of certain references the reviewer is uncertain about the reliability of such sources and encourage the authors to include journal articles as well (e.g., the reference such as Molecules. 2019 Aug; 24(15): 2825 for reference 18).3. A lot of inappropriate references have been given to show the previous works of the authors (self-citation). This is totally inappropriate and the reviewer does not understand the rationale of such action (for e.g., reference 38 is Covid-19 Knowledge and Perceptions Among Dental Specialists).4. The standard format of presenting the materials and methods are not followed and references for the methodology are not provided.5. Figures and tables are not provided appropriately.6. Reviewer strongly suggests the authors to follow the guidelines and resubmit.7. The authors identified in vivo model to check the efficacy as an objective but not provided the methodology or data.8. The overall feeling of the reviewer is that the authors have not focused on presenting their work in a methodical and appropriate manner thus suggest revisiting the work again and rewrite to be compatible with the author guidelines of the journal.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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> This is basically an in vitro study; since the authors have obtained an ethical clearance the reviewer would like to identify ethical clearance number and the submission of the institution whether they have obtained it to the journal office given the double-blind peer review process.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	N. S. Soysa
Department, University & Country	University of Peradeniya, Sri Lanka