

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80087
Title of the Manuscript:	Protocol on Comparative efficacy of <i>Bruhatyadi Kwath</i> as compared to Furosemide for improving e –GFR and Albuminuria in Chronic Kidney Disease.
Type of the Article	

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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Abstract</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify the background, aims and objectives in these lines "The steady decrease of kidney function is referred to as chronic kidney disease. The kidney function is measured by Golmerular Filtration Rate (GFR). According to Ayurveda the CKD can be correlated to <i>Mutraghata</i> because of similarity of symptoms. In Ayurveda <i>Mutraghata</i> is described under <i>Mutrarogaw</i> which comes under <i>Mutravahastrotas</i> (urinary system)". Results is not explain here "Subjective and objectives outcomes will be assessed by statistical analysis. Conclusion: It will be drawn from the result obtained" <p>Introduction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I didn't find any references / citation in the introduction, add recent papers citation because this work is the comparisons of current and future. Rest is fine <p>Methodology</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Looks ordinary cite with references. <p>Results</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Didn't find any results comparisons of current and future work related to kidney diseases Time chart is not necessary 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The current paper is good enough, and I recommend for publication	

Review Form 1.6

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:	Muhammad Shuaib
Department, University & Country	Yunnan university, China