

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_104889
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness of Kasa Kasa Kudineer in treating Insomnia patients attending OPD at AAGHIM, Chennai – A Case Series
Type of the Article	Case study

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><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The topic is important from the view of understanding varied treatment possibilities for insomnia. Knowledge of Siddha Medicine in the treatment of insomnia may influence prescribing behaviour. The paper has undertaken a survey among a small group of patients to suggest an additional treatment modality.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>(i) The methodology of selecting the sample size and sampling method that was used is not specified. (ii) Author may kindly clarify the short duration of 2 weeks chosen for patient observation and why the observation period could not be longer.</p> <p>References pertaining to insomnia prevalence are 10 years old and may be updated to include more recent studies</p> <p>Other comments:</p> <p>(i) The patients were advised to consume the decoction at bedtime- what was the bedtime prescribed for the patients (ii) The duration of sleep is not mentioned anywhere in the study; why was this aspect not studied (iii) How was it ensured that the decoction was prepared by the patients as advised? (iv) Since it is a self-reported study without any clinical method utilised for testing, there is a possibility of bias in reporting from the patients side. How was this possibility eliminated?</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Generally OK, however Discussion part can be better written.</p> <p>Other minor revision comments:</p> <p>(i) The ability of the Insomnia Severity Index (ISI) to discriminate between primary insomnia and insomnia comorbid with other psychiatric or medical disorders remains unknown. Author needs to clarify this aspect</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>(i) The assessment of insomnia is multidimensional and should ideally include a clinical evaluation and be complemented by self-report questionnaires and daily sleep diaries. Study methodology may be suitably modified for bigger samples</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Oommen Nainan
Department, University & Country	Army Dental Centre, India