

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_87541
Title of the Manuscript:	Lepidium Sativum seed mucilage: Development of a systematic Extraction and Isolation process with maximum yield
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	<p>Report on: <b><i>Lepidium Sativum</i> seed mucilage: Development of a systematic Extraction and Isolation process with maximum yield</b></p> <p>The authors, in this article, investigation helps to isolate the seed mucilage of <i>Lepidium Sativum</i> by using an economic extraction process with utmost yield. The yield of the seed mucilage of <i>Lepidium Sativum</i> was optimized by using a quality by design approach. The article sounds good i appreciate their efforts however, the following changes would make it more interesting for the readers, and I think it could be published with major revisions. The authors have cited several relevant references to build up the present model's literature review. However, it is not sufficient. It is vast but not comprehensively focused on the relevance of the problem chosen in the manuscript. Authors should update the introduction section by including recent articles published explicitly in the last two-three years. For example, <a href="#">10.21203/rs.3.rs-810314/v1</a>, and <a href="#">10.26717/BJSTR.2021.34.005492</a>. <a href="#">10.3390/polym13132089</a>, <a href="#">10.1007/s10924-021-02142-1</a>, <a href="#">10.3389/fbioe.2021.797672</a>.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li></li><li>Add some quantitative and qualitative data in the conclusion.</li><li>Rewrite this with new references. The different plant-derived products are highly enriched with different phytochemical constituents, showing different therapeutic activities against critical and chronic diseases`</li><li>The different levels of variables along with coded and un-coded factors of experimental design are presented in table 2 and table 3. Rewrite this.</li><li>However, based on the design of experiment trials the modified extraction process was proposed. Need to improve.</li><li>There are so many mistakes in writing please check carefully.</li></ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>We agree with the reviewer's suggestion. The conclusion section was modified with the qualitative and quantitative findings.</li><li>The introduction part was modified with relevant references related to current study. Many references were included to provide a logical flow to the reader and care has been taken to justify the current study with the available literature</li><li>All the sentences referred by the reviewer for introduction, method and results section was modified in the revised manuscript.</li><li>The discussion part modified with probable reason of the observed findings. Whenever required suitable reference was also cited to made a comparison or to strengthen the logic cited for the finding</li></ol>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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>	