

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77370
Title of the Manuscript:	Cytotoxic Effect of Pterocarpus santalinus and stevia based mouthwash - A Lab based analysis.
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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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>-Abstract: The introduction to the abstract must not be the same as the introduction to the article in its letter, so it must be modified</p> <p>-Abstract: The conclusion should be based on the results of the article and not on the generality. That should be modified</p> <p>-The reference must be given to the following sentence: "Stevia's taste has a slower beginning and longer span than that of sugar, and a portion of its concentrates may have a harsh or licorice-like lingering flavor at high fixations." - Explain this sentence in more detail: "The sampling was done in an unbiased manner by random sampling method. - Why use two versions of SPSS? - What did you rely on to prepare the solution in this way? Is there a reference that supports this? Why was Non parametric correlation used? And is there a statistical power of the study?? Why are Pearson correlation analysis and spearman correlation analysis used? This should be explained Was a test conducted to determine the adequacy of the sample size? -You must support your opinion (this paragraph) with references: "The corrosive assists the body with engrossing chromium. Randomized controlled preliminaries have neglected to exhibit a connection between chromium supplementation and the counteraction or treatment of type 2 diabetes or debilitated glucose resilience. Chromium supplementation of young men and women doesn't advance muscle gradual addition, fat misfortune, or gains in strength. Physically active people with concern about gathering rules for supplement admission ought to be directed to choose and burn-through food sources with high supplement densities instead of to depend on wholesome enhancements. Chromium picolinate interceded zinc oxide nanoparticles show great outcomes in antimicrobial action just as in cytotoxicity."</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>-I prefer to put (-) in the title between stevia based and Lab based (to become stevia-based and Lab-based)</p> <p>-There are references in which the abbreviation of the journal name is not written: 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 20, 24, 35, 37-52</p> <p>- Mention the names or symbols of the people who performed the validation</p> <p>- There is no need to repeat the idea, so please delete this sentence (because it was mentioned at the end of the paragraph) Correlation analyses were done to analyse the cytotoxic activity with the help of SPSS (version 23).</p> <p>-Please mention the complete term of all abbreviations as MTT</p>	
Optional/General comments	- Improving the English language (grammarizing it)	

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>	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hala Albonni
Department, University & Country	Damascus University, Syria