

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_129394
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSING THE IMMUNOMODULATORY POTENTIAL OF OYSTER MUSHROOM (<i>Pleurotus ostreatus</i>) SUPPLEMENTATION IN SENDAI VIRUS-INFECTED WISTAR RATS.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 (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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides insights into the immunomodulatory and therapeutic potential of oyster mushroom (<i>Pleurotus ostreatus</i>) supplementation in the context of viral infections. By exploring its effects on hematological parameters, liver and kidney function, CD4 counts, viral load, and histopathological changes, the study contributes to understanding how natural compounds can aid in mitigating the impact of viral diseases. The findings highlight the dual role of the mushroom supplement in enhancing immune recovery and reducing viral load, suggesting its potential as an adjunct in viral infection management.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title is suitable.	
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 solid overview of the study, but there are areas where it could be improved for clarity. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ While the abstract mentions "the highest dose," specifying the doses tested would provide more clarity and context for the results. ➤ The statement on hematological parameters ("varying effects") is vague. Highlight the specific groups or conditions under which RBC and platelet counts improved 	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is fundamentally scientifically correct and contains promising data, but minor revisions requires to enhanced clarity of manuscript. Addressing following points will strengthen its scientific rigor and potential impact. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Expand on the preparation and composition of the oyster mushroom supplement (e.g., extraction process, dosages in mg/kg body weight). ➤ Include additional controls, such as a group receiving a standard antiviral treatment, to strengthen the comparative analysis. ➤ Highlight key findings in the text that align with the data tables. ➤ Emphasize the implications of the findings, particularly how oyster mushroom supplementation compares to existing immunomodulatory strategies. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references cited in the manuscript appear to be sufficient. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Ensure that all scientific names italicized consistently. ➤ In some references, volume and issue numbers are presented without a space between them (e.g., 41(1)), which is generally acceptable but might differ depending on the citation style you're using. Make sure this is consistent throughout. ➤ In some cases, page ranges are given, and in others, they aren't. Ensure all references that should have page numbers do. 	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Overall, the manuscript is comprehensible and well-structured, but careful proofreading and editing will improve its quality for publication	
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Deepak Kumar
Department, University & Country	GPGC Bazpur (US Nagar) Uttarakhand, India