

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_86229
Title of the Manuscript:	IN VITRO ANTIOXIDANT ACTIVITY OF PARANGIPPATAI RASAYANAM - A SIDDHA POLYHERBAL FORMULATION
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>

Review Form 1.6

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>The authors are appreciated for their effort in validating a Siddha classical drug formulation namely Parangipattai rasayanam.</p> <p>Besides their efforts, to ensure the quality of the research and also the quality of the journal the following queries were raised whose clarifications are highly essential for the publication of the manuscript:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Define the acronym for Parangipatai Rasayanam. PRM or PPR. 2. In introduction part, check the spelling of Kayakarpam, it is different in two places. 3. The introduction part can also be revised as the flow of the content is not uniform. 4. Whether the formulation was prepared by the authors on their own or purchased from some GMP certified Pharma company? 5. If the formulation was prepared by the authors, their QC data is missing in the manuscript. Though it doesn't fall under the scope of the study, the QC data is essential as per WHO guidelines. 6. Having more than 20 ingredients and being a rasayanam form of formulation, does it get completely soluble in any solvent? In DPPH assay, it was mentioned as methanol but in other assays no solvent is mentioned. Kindly clarify. 7. The anupanam or adjuvant of the drug is not mentioned. Based on that only the solvent can be selected so that it can achieve same effect under physiological conditions too. 8. Does DPPH assay require 37°C inhibition? If so, mention the reason. 9. Always any standard solution or stock solution in which concentration matters should be prepared in standard measuring flask, the authors have mentioned it as test tube dilution. How the concentration will be uniform in test tube dilution. 10. Why Nitric oxide assay alone is measured in microplate reader? What about other ABTS and hydrogen peroxide assays? 11. The results can be expressed in line graph format for easy understanding. 12. The discussion part of the manuscript is missing. <p>The authors are required to revise the manuscript as per above queries and can resubmit the paper for publication.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	-	
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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gayathri Gunalan
Department, University & Country	Siddha Regional Research Institute, India