

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_96434
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comparative Pharmaceutico-Analytical Study of Saindavadi Ghrita Prepared with Murchchhit and Amurchchhit Ghrita and Evaluation of Its Antiepileptic Efficacy in Swiss Albino Mice – A Study Protocol
Type of the Article	Study Protocol

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 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, it was important for scientific community because instead of going for Allopathic medical treatment which is more expensive Ayurvedic medicine is advisable.</p> <p>Title suits for this article.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript can be modified which will enhances the presentation paper. Yes, the manuscript was scientifically discussed correctly.</p> <p>The references mentioned are sufficient and recent articles were included.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The manuscripts writing is good and easy to understand about the aim of the article.</p> <p>2. Introduction part can be partitioned in to two paragraphs, then specify the meaning of Apasmara in Ayurvedic as Apa means 'Loss' and 'Smara' means 'Memory'. In Allopathy it was mentioned Epilepsy.</p> <p>3. In plan of study, ingredients for Ghrita Murchchhana and preparation were mentioned, whereas about the preparation of Amurchchit Ghrita details were not discussed.</p> <p>4. In methodology briefly give details about the Pentylenetetrazole – Induced seizure method and Maximal Electroshock seizure method.</p> <p>5. About Dunnett's multiple comparison details can be specified.</p> <p>6. In discussion part the details given in the introduction part was repeated it can be avoided.</p> <p>7. In conclusion whether the comparative study is carried out or not for MSG and ASG. If so specify which is better or otherwise give a clear conclusion about the work.</p> <p>Typo graphical errors:</p> <p>1. In observations & Results don't use symbol '&' specify in words as 'and', then for analysis of variance specify it as Analysis and Variance.</p> <p>2. Specify the table name above the tabular column and use capital letter for all the table name uniformly.</p> <p>3. In experimental study specify full form for 'HD' and also give full form for 'EFSA'.</p> <p>4. In the manuscript, the subsections and structure can be specified with numbering or subdivisions properly. So that it was easy to understand the work.</p> <p>5. These corrections can be carried out to enrich the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	P. Suguna
Department, University & Country	Annamalai University, India