

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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	The approach towards the investigation on the effects of a mushroom-based supplement on hematological parameters, liver and kidney function, CD4 counts, viral load, and histopathological changes in Sendai virus-infected Wistar rats is commendable. The findings on the mushroom-based supplement and certain beneficial effects on hematological parameters and its effects on supporting the immune response in Sendai virus-infected rats is well documented.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	YES	
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.	Yes, the abstract is well comprehended for the titled article.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is technically complemented to the work done.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the author provided sufficient and recent literature to support the article.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the communicative language reveals the clarity for the readers for better understanding of the nature of the work done.	
Optional/General comments	In general, the total article is well documented to the title with high clarity and supportive literatures.	

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:	L.Aswini
Department, University & Country	India