

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_86962
Title of the Manuscript:	In-vivo Antioxidant's Modulatory properties of Justicia carnea Aqueous Leave Extract on Sheep Red Blood Cells Immunized Mice
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>Title Title is too complex to understand what its actually concern. It should be more simply that it is easier to catch the main topic that have done and what is the meaning of the each component. Now there is antioxidants, extract of leave and name, sheep red blood cells and mice. There is too much things without explaining words and that should be more simple and more catching the reader.</p> <p>Abstract - Are the all mentioned subheadings really needed? Could Study design, Place and Duration of Study, Methodology all be under one subheading e.g. Material and Methods - was vehicle distilled water or physiological buffered NaCl? - How where groups selected? Why Sheep Red Blood Cells is one group and not added as well same time with Justicia carnea (JC)? Are those groups compared to each other or what? Now title is more confusing. - Need to explain Levamisole - not need to inform at abstract all detailes of Place and Duration of Study that should be at Material section - This need to clarify " All groups were immunized at day zero and day 5 with SRBC inducing immune response except for the VEH group that was not immunized." need to combine with study design and inform with group details. And combain to Justicia carnea and explain how to treated. Now there is a lot of thing said but not given whole picture of important details. - Please check measured antioxidant enzymes! If some of them are more as oxidative stress markers e.g. malondialdehyde? - not need to mark P < 0.05. Significant is enough in abstract. Please check Abstract again and make it short but detailed enough to give whole picture. Now there is some caps e.g. how justicia carnea & Sheep Red Blood Cells are coupled or only compared the responses? Give little bit more info about LEV is a standard drug e.g. one sentence how used and that relate to the particular research -Please give some relevant conclusion not only that effects were as evaluated. Give some big picture of Justicia carnea and the purpose of study or some phenomeno background of the research. → Those things are better inform in introduction and main things need to shortly open as well in abstract to give little bit better picture</p> <p>Introduction - Is this really right way to explain "Oxidative stress is an immunological expression..."? - please, check all abbreviations (some opening is missed) - please clarify the "In this study the antioxidants of interest are..". Especially antioxidants. Some of those are markers of oxidative stress and radicals or radical producer not antioxidants. Those still can measure but need to take into account when view the result.</p> <p>Material and methods - J. carnea Extract Yield was mentioned first time in material and methods section. All methods should appear also in abstract and at least that should as well mention that have done etc. - inform as well exact doses for mices - Why this is mentioned "Candida albicans" - Why five (5) Wistar Rats weighing between 140 – 160 g and 73 mice weighing? Why only so small amount of rats and it is enough? Is there really used rats or only mices? - please, give more detailed information related to biochemical measurements e.g. protocol for detection and reagents/kits</p> <p>Results - is there more exact amounts related to table 1. Just the presence of chemical not tell enough. - Prepare result pictures as symmetric and may less color is better - Figure 2 is confusing. Need to explain more. It is not open easily for reader? Is it needed at all.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fill result section and related figure legends. Results are not comprehensively presented. and titles or bolded texts are confusing. - Because IL-2 is mentioned and ROS vs inflammation in Introduction it would be interesting to see effects/results on the IL2. - Text need to be closer of the figure. Not all at the end of the all results figures. And please, full figure legends. -There is lot of weight data but that is not mentioned in abstract or introduction part and not handled etc. It is little bit confusing that results still concentrates to those as much. - Please modify results part to easier read. Now text part and related the result is overwhelmed. <p>Discussion -Why discussion is divided by subheadins? -Should be shorter and need to be clarify throughout.</p> <p>Conclusion - This " With further focus on the plant, as substantial source for vaccine adjuvants development" comes quite suddenly and need to explain little bit more related to the topic.</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:	Niina Bhattarai
Department, University & Country	University of Eastern Finland, Finland