

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_83625
Title of the Manuscript:	REVIEW ON CHITOSAN INTAKE AND ENHANCEMENT IN FECAL EXCRETION OF ENDOCRINE DISRUPTORS
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>

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>The title is suggestive and mentions the points covered in the content.</p> <p>ABSTRACT: The abstract presents a broad description of the functions of chitin and chitosan but does not focus the reader's interest on what is intended to be shown in this work, so it is suggested to improve the wording of the abstract.</p> <p>KEYWORDS: It is suggested to arrange the keywords in alphabetical order.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The format of figure one needs to be standardized, it is not the same format in the whole figure. 2. Indicate the source of figure 1 or if it is a personal creation 3. Look for connecting links between paragraphs two and three of the introduction; there is no correlation at first sight between the two paragraphs, better wording is suggested. 4. Change the physicochemical property to the plural.... "physicochemical properties" in the third paragraph of the introduction. 5. Indicate the source of figure 2 or if it is a personal creation. 6. At the end of the introduction it is suggested to change "we have elaborated" to we mention 7. It is suggested to change the numbering. Leave the introduction part without numeral and start the numbering with: BIOMEDICAL PROPERTIES OF CHITIN AND CHITOSAN <p>NUMERAL 2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Write invitro and invivo in italics, and they are two words. 2. Change "was studied" by was investigated. 3. Studies by Ueno et al. (mention the year in parentheses). 4. [10] [1] switch to [1] [10] 5. Studies by Minagawa et al. (mention the year in parentheses). <p>NUMERAL 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is EPA?, describe the acronym. 2. Indicate the source of figure 3 or if it is a personal creation. 3. are [16][15] change to [15][16] are: 4. Write invitro and invivo in italics, and they are two words. 5. What is BPA?, describe the acronym. <p>NUMERAL 4</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is PCB?, describe the acronym. 2. by cytochrome enzymes change by cytochrome P450 enzymes <p>NUMERAL 5</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Changing the intestinal flora by the intestinal microbiota 2. L-K Han et al. (mention the year in parentheses). 3. Write invitro and invivo in italics, and they are two words. 4. What is ICR?, describe the acronym. 5. Look for connecting links between paragraphs one and two of this numeral; there is no correlation at first sight between the two paragraphs, better wording is suggested. 	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>NUMERAL 6</p> <p>6.1 1. A study was designed by Noriyuki Kohda (mention the year in parentheses).</p> <p>6.2 1. A study was designed by Noriyuki Kohda (mention the year in parentheses).</p> <p>6.3 1. A study was designed by Noriyuki Kohda (mention the year in parentheses).</p> <p>6.4 1. A study was designed by Noriyuki Kohda (mention the year in parentheses).</p> <p>The article pretends to be a review and only one author is mentioned (Noriyuki Kohda), this does not guarantee the study of this article as a review, several studies (at least two others) on the same subject should be considered, for a better confrontation of the results found.</p> <p>CONCLUSION: 1. <i>I consider that the conclusions are very poor, and this is due to the fact that the article does not include more bibliography consulted.</i></p> <p>REFERENCES: 1) References should be exactly as per the journal format, refer a recent article from the current issue. 2) It is suggested to have more updated bibliographic references.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1) Careful spacing between words and paragraphs. 2) The citations are complete and correspond to the bibliographic references.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>1) The article is well written and organized. 2) The article is very interesting and informative. 3) The introduction shows a good content of the topic that places the reader in the interest of the study. 3) The length of the article is adequate and meets the criteria required by the publication. 4) Improve punctuation marks.</p>	

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:	Carlos Hernan Herrera Mendez
Department, University & Country	Universidad De Guanajuato, Mexico