

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77302
Title of the Manuscript:	Formulation of Cake with Banana Peel Extracts to Enhance Colour and Bioactive Properties
Type of the Article	Short 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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

	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		
Background	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background was limited in information and the problem statement was not clear. In addition, most of the information provided, especially in the first section seemed to be the authors own words (No reference cited) The specific objectives were very carelessly written and they couldn't have been testable 	Agreed Objectives revised
Methodology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The methodology section was very carelessly written: <p>✓ The study design was not clear!! It later showed that the study involved two banana varieties which then would have obvious been a comparison study but the writer downplayed that that kept writing as if variety was not important.</p> <p>✓ The writer did not also provide the method they used to analyse the different parameters in the study. It is important that these methods and or their references are stated to easy replication of your study by interested parties</p>	Methodology revised Small banana variety was used to develop the product. It was mentioned now
Results and Discussion	<p>✓ There seemed to be no statistical analysis carried out on the results obtained from the study</p> <p>✓ The section on sensory evaluation was not scientifically written therefore the study cannot be replicated and there was no reference given</p>	Methods mentioned Included now Included
Conclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This section was very poorly written: <p>✓ Since the study was obviously comparing 2 types of bananas, this did not clearly come out in the discussion and in many instances there was no reference to previous studies.</p> <p>✓ Some results (phytochemical content) were presented as present or absent which results should have been quantified for comparison between the 2 bananas and with previous studies.</p> <p>✓ The discussion was non existent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The conclusions were not based on the specific objectives, therefore the authors need to restate the objectives and then derive conclusions from them. 	Revised Done Made clear
Minor REVISION comments		
	The article is lacking in scientific standards: vague study design, no statistical analysis carried out on the results, non-existent discussion etc etc	Agreed Revised now
Optional/General comments		
	The authors wrote this article carelessly, with lots of wrong grammar and it also contained numerous redundant statements.	Revised

Review Form 1.6

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	No ethical issues