

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80741
Title of the Manuscript:	Pharmaceutical standardization of Palasha Kshara (alkali extract of Butea monosperma Lam.) prepared from two combinations
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:

<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

### **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>The work is original, important and transcendent, the abstract contains elements such as introduction, problem statement, objective, method, results and conclusion. The introduction describes the general to the particular, raises what has been published and raises the problem and rounds it up with the general objective and particulars, in addition to supporting it with 13 references, the methodology is clear, it has 12 references, only there are that 4 of them are repeated and have a non-indexed reference, the information presented in the results is adequately discussed, in this discussion section it only has 7 references, I think it needs to rely on other authors to enrich this section, it is met what had been raised</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>The work is well structured, only small observations have to be corrected in a non-substantive way, such as, for example, it has closing of parentheses and the opening of the same is missing, some of the links of the references They are not activated, there is a reference in the materials section and methods in the fourth line that is not found in a homogeneous way, in this same section it is necessary to indicate the geographical place from where the samples were taken and be more forceful with respect to the fact that the proposed objective was met</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Review Form 1.6**

**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>Carlos Meza López</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas, México</b>