

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80672
Title of the Manuscript:	In-vitro Antioxidant and Pharmacognostic Studies of Phaseolus vulgaris (Linn) seed coat
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<div><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- All words / sentences / paragraphs highlighted in yellow are well reviewed (some are deleted, added, or modified etc.) as the context requires.</li><li>- Please, write the article according to the General Guidelines for Manuscript Preparation for JPIR system.</li><li>- The language of writing in the research is not good at all and is incorrect.. Reviewing the entire language of the research.. As all parts of the research need a comprehensive linguistic review.</li><li>- <u>Very very important..</u> This paper is not based on rigorous academic standards.. The scientific basis of the study on which the researcher (s) relied (the qualitative analysis of the bioactive compounds in the plant part under study) is completely incorrect, and is not practically suitable for research studies for the following reasons:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The qualitative analysis of the compounds is evidence only of the presence of these compounds in the plant part(s), regardless of their presence in large concentrations or in very small concentrations that may reach traces, which results in not specifying any kind of importance/significance (food - medical - economic etc.).</li><li>- The bioactive compounds may be present in the plant part at a concentration of "traces", as the test showed. However, there is no benefit in that because such weak concentrations are unable to cause any of its biological effects.</li><li>- In scientific research (explanation of significance - comparisons - discussions, etc.), only quantitative estimates of the compounds to be estimated are considered. As the qualitative analysis has no limits or meaning for its terms such as: present, absent etc.</li><li>- The qualitative analysis does not come out with concentrations or percentages of compounds, and therefore it is not suitable for conducting studies of importance and economic feasibility.</li><li>- Qualitative analysis is not possible by transferring the study from the laboratory scale to the applied/large scale.</li><li>- As long as the researcher has based his recommendations mainly on the qualitative analysis, the recommendations resulting from the study are weak and unrealistic and it cannot be relied upon to transfer the study from the laboratory scale to the applied/large scale.</li></ul></li><li>- The research lacks the simplest scientific rules used in writing research. For example, it is very strange that the results of the study are placed under the research materials and methods section. Also, the part of results is without the results etc.???</li></ul></div> <div><p><b>Abstract</b></p><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- This part (Abstract) is not good.</li><li>- The abstract has some rules and scientific principles in writing, as it consists of: The objective of the study - a summary of the experimental design - some results or numbers reached by the study - in the end, the study's abstract, In conclusion, etc.</li><li>- The sentences should be placed in the appropriate place without mixing.</li></ul></div>	All the changes have been incorporated and highlighted in the article.

## Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The entire term is written after the abbreviation in parentheses for the first time only and then the abbreviations are used only after that throughout the search</li><li>- It is preferable that the keywords do not contain the words contained in the study title (because the title words appear mainly on the search on the international information network), so other words from the estimated search results are preferred to increase the chances of the search appearing on the international information network.</li></ul> <p><b>INTRODUCTION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The introduction to the research lacks all the principles and rules of professional writing. Everything that is written has nothing to do with the content of the research at all. For example, you are talking about <b><i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> (Linn) seed coat</b> and its bioactive compounds only, what does this have to do with epilepsy?</li><li>- The introduction has principles of writing that must be taken into account (refer please to similar research in major scientific journals to realize what is written, which is completely away from any scientific professional)</li><li>- Where is the aim of the study? It is the simplest scientific rules that the introduction to the research ends with the aim of the study.</li></ul> <p><b>Materials and Methods</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- What is written under this part has nothing to do with the materials and methods of research. One of the epidemiology of research is that this part deals with research materials and methods of analysis and their documentation.</li><li>- It is very strange that the results of the study are placed under the research materials and methods section.</li><li>- <b><u>Very very important..</u></b> This paper is not based on rigorous academic standards.. The scientific basis of the study on which the researcher (s) relied (the qualitative analysis of the bioactive compounds in the plant part under study) is completely incorrect, and is not practically suitable for research studies for the following reasons:</li><li>- The qualitative analysis of the compounds is evidence only of the presence of these compounds in the plant part(s), regardless of their presence in large concentrations or in very small concentrations that may reach traces, which results in not specifying any kind of importance/significance (food - medical - economic etc.).</li><li>- The bioactive compounds may be present in the plant part at a concentration of "traces", as the test showed. However, there is no benefit in that because such weak concentrations are unable to cause any of its biological effects.</li><li>- In scientific research (explanation of significance - comparisons - discussions, etc.), only quantitative estimates of the compounds to be estimated are considered. As the qualitative analysis has no limits or meaning for its terms such as: present, absent etc.</li><li>- The qualitative analysis does not come out with concentrations or percentages of compounds, and therefore it is not suitable for conducting studies of importance and economic feasibility.</li><li>- Qualitative analysis is not possible by transferring the study from the laboratory scale to the applied/large scale.</li><li>- As long as the researcher has based his recommendations mainly on the qualitative analysis, the recommendations resulting from the study are weak and unrealistic and it cannot be relied upon to transfer the study from the laboratory scale to the applied/large scale.</li></ul> <p><b>Results and Discussion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- <b>Where are the results to be discussed?</b></li><li>- <b>Where are the discussions?</b></li><li>- In conclusion, written in a way that is not good at all.. It must be within (5-6 sentences) that summarizes the most important findings of the research in terms of directions for results and recommendations.</li></ul>	
--	---	--

Review Form 1.6

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	-----	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	-----	

**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>	