

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_81631
Title of the Manuscript:	A Systematic Medico Historical Review of Gokshura (Tribulus terrestris L.): A Traditional Indian Medicine
Type of the Article	Review 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>Many reviews on Tribulus terrestris were reported in the past decades, and the authors summarized systematically to reveal the classic and experience-based traditional uses of Gokshura for health and wellness, especially the views or opinions on Gokshura in different historical periods. The scope of knowledge in this manuscript is very wide, including the name, basic pharmaceutical forms, classification, kinds of Gokshura etc. but the content is very simple. This manuscript is more like a summary of Gokshura than a review. Although the authors have their own unique perspective compared to other reported reviews, however, I think the following should be improved.</p> <p>1 As a review, it should be a good summary based on the existing references, not simply a list of knowledge. Apparently, the authors did not pay attention to this flaw in the manuscript. Such as section eighth: "Gokshura for health and well-being in Ayurveda". Due to long historical period, the author uses the classification method to introduce briefly stage by stage, which is not as intuitive as using a graph or a table.</p> <p>2 The summary of references in the manuscript is not enough, especially for the summary of Pharmacological actions. The authors may list more evidences, not one reference to account for active studies.</p> <p>For example, there are actually many references on anthelmintic activity published: Deepak M, Dipankar G, Prashanth D, et al. Tribulosin and β-sitosterol-D-glucoside, the anthelmintic principles of <i>Tribulus terrestris</i>[J]. Phytomedicine, 2002, 9(8): 753-756. Kumar, A. S., B. V. Rama Rao, Y. Narendra. "Proximate analysis and comparative in vitro anti microbial and anthelmintic activities of different parts of <i>Tribulus terrestris</i> linn." 2011, 3(8): 37-44.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>More formatting errors and spelling mistake should be corrected.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Xi-Lin Ouyang
Department, University & Country	Gannan Healthcare Vocational College, China