

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_79178
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Nutrient, Mineral analysis and quality characterization of <i>Gymnema sylvestre</i> multi grain cookies for diabetes.
Type of the Article	Full length 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:

<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-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>* Authors should carefully read the author's instructions and correct any deficiencies. In particular, the citation of references in the text, which must be numbered in the order of appearance and between brackets.</p> <p>* In the Material & Methods part :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For better precision of the proximate composition analysis, authors must put the reference of the protocol in front the corresponding parameter (the proposed version is ambiguous). - They need also to provide more details on the the Atomic Absorption Spectroscopy method for the analysis of Sodium and potassium content (such as: machine model, internal standard used, calibration curves applied...) - Authors must mention the protocol's references of Biochemical Tests and isolation of microbe. - Authors must add details on the protocol of the identification of bacterial colonies ! - Authors must add a paragraph about the statistical analysis (number of repetitions and the nature of the chosen statistical test). <p>* Authors must discuss the results of the isolation of microbe and compare them to existing data or microbial criteria.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>* For the isolation of microbe, it is better to rewrite the description according to my correction (line number 114 – 117) (Please check my enclosed version).</p> <p>* Authors need to add legends on table 2, 3 & 5 to facilitate the independent reading.</p> <p>* I think that the bibliographical references must be updated.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Nadir Boudjlal Dergal
Department, University & Country	University of Oran 1, Algeria