

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_130319
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE STUDY OF AROMATIC PROPERTY FROM IR SPECTRAL INTERPRETATION OF FRESH FRUIT AND DRIED FRUIT DATE SEEDS CINDERS (COLLECTED FROM JAIPUR, RAJASTHAN) AND ITS EVALUATION BY UV SPECTROSCOPY ACCORDING TO ICH GUIDELINES
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	In this study, is successfully depicted the aromatic behaviour of dried date seeds in high concentration which was also found in case of fresh seeds but in less amount. The data present are important for the date fruit growers, producers, food and pharmaceutical industry.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	A shorter title could by more useful, for example: COMPARATIVE STUDY OF AROMATIC PROPERTY OF FRESH AND DRIED FRUIT DATE BY UV SPECTROSCOPY	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes, the abstract has the proper length, and is comprehensive.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references are sufficient and recent. Also, the references are on the topic of the paper.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the English language is suitable for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Calugar Anamaria
Department, University & Country	University of Agricultural Science and Veterinary Medicine of Cluj Napoca, Romania