

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_83088
Title of the Manuscript:	Formulation and Evaluation of Herbal Baby Shampoo
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:

<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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript titled "Formulation and Evaluation of Herbal Baby Shampoo" is interesting. However, I have the following observation and requests:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Although the manuscript is interesting, it is poorly written, so request to rewrite the whole manuscript. In some places language is tedious and some expressions are not proper, so the manuscript must be polished and revised. 2) The abstract should give clear information about the whole paper. So, request to rewrite it. An abstract should summarize the major aspects of the entire paper in a sequence; a) the overall purpose of the study and research problem you investigated; b) methods used in the study; c) major findings or results of your analysis and; d) summary of your interpretations and conclusions. 3) The introduction, methods, results, and discussion are written poorly. Rewrite the introduction and add more latest articles. Request to rewrite these sections with more latest references. Make a proper discussion of your results. 4) Too long conclusions portion. It moreover seems like the contents that would fit under results and discussion. Make a clear and concise conclusion. 5) Make a proper arrangement of figures within the manuscript. 6) Make the front of the botanical/taxonomic name in italic. 7) Very little data. 8) Proper management of references is required. Cite the references properly. Request to cross-check references, whether they have been cited correctly or not. Make them accordingly to the journal format. More latest references should be added. 	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> 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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tran Dinh Manh
Department, University & Country	Institute of Applied Technology, Thu Dau Mot University, Vietnam