

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JPRI_123008</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Evaluation of in-vitro anthelmintic and in-vivo analgesic and antidepressant activities of methanolic extract of Pseuderanthemum latifolium</b>
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: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it explores the analgesic, antidepressant, and anthelmintic activities of <i>Pseuderanthemum latifolium</i>, a plant with traditional medicinal uses. The study provides preliminary evidence of the plant's therapeutic potential, which could pave the way for new treatments for pain, depression, and parasitic infections. I like this manuscript because it addresses a relevant topic with clear experimental methodology and promising results that add value to the field of ethnopharmacology.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The current title is suitable as it accurately reflects the content of the study.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive and effectively summarizes the study's objectives, methods, results, and conclusions. No additions or deletions are suggested.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>Yes, the subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are appropriate and well-organized, facilitating easy understanding of the study.</p>	
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound as it employs standard experimental models and methods to evaluate the pharmacological activities of the plant extract. The results are clearly presented, and the statistical analysis appears appropriate, supporting the conclusions drawn by the authors. The findings are consistent with the hypothesis and contribute valuable knowledge about the therapeutic properties of <i>P. latifolium</i>.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>The references are sufficient and include recent studies relevant to the topic. No additional references are required at this time.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but a few minor typographical errors and corrections are needed, as highlighted in the attached Word file with comments.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is well-written and the study is conducted meticulously. Minor revisions will enhance the clarity and presentation of the research.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Amanulla Khan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>India</b>