

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_122221
Title of the Manuscript:	Hypolipidemic Activity Of Manjal Noiku Kudineer Against Atherogenic Diet-Induced Hyperlipidemia In Experimental Rats
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it explores the hypolipidemic potential of Manjal Noiku Kudineer, a Siddha polyherbal formulation, offering an alternative approach to managing hyperlipidemia, a major risk factor for cardiovascular diseases. The study's results, demonstrating a reduction in lipid profiles and minimal liver damage, provide evidence for the therapeutic potential of traditional medicine in modern healthcare. I appreciate this manuscript for its integration of traditional knowledge with contemporary scientific methods, offering a promising avenue for the development of new antihyperlipidemic treatments. However, I would have liked to see a more detailed comparison with standard treatments like Atorvastatin to better understand the efficacy of Manjal Noiku Kudineer in a broader clinical context.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is ok	
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.	The abstract provides a clear overview of the study, demonstrating the hypolipidemic activity of Manjal Noiku Kudineer in reducing lipid profiles and liver damage in hyperlipidemic rats. However, it would benefit from including a comparison with standard treatments and a brief concluding sentence to emphasize the study's broader implications.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections are ok, add standard error measurement in bar graphs to make it accurate	
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.	Spellings, punctuations, words, spaces thoroughly need to be checked.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Some more recent references on the topic are suggestive to add	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Thorough checking for minor errors need to be rectified	
Optional/General comments		

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 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abu Md Ashif Ikbal
Department, University & Country	Assam University, India