



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_25467
Title of the Manuscript:	The Nutraceuticals: A Voluminous Torrent in Pharmaceuticals- Coupling Health & Drugs
Type of the Article	Review paper

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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Thorough English language and grammar fixing. Please refer to a specialised native speaker of to a proofreading agency.</p> <p>Lack of relevant references related to clinical trials. For example, as for Osteoarthritis there is only one basic science mentioned reference and it is even wrong.</p> <p>The paragraph on pro-biotic is very poor absolutely lacking update and in the table only diarrhea and common dysbiosis is referred to while there is a huge research in the field. Unacceptable as it is.</p> <p>Nutrigenomics concepts have to be tackled to clearly differentiate "supplementation for deficiencies" from the epigenetic mechanisms exerted by nutraceuticals. The whole world is moving on gene expression by food and nutraceuticals.</p> <p>The literature abound of in vitro, animal and clinical studies on FPP (fermented papaya preparation) as a blatant example how it is possible to run double-blind RCT studies with some highly-studied nutraceuticals but these have totally neglected. On the other hand, an unnecessary mention of commercial names in the table is reported. This is a strident conflict.</p>	<p>Aptly taken care off.</p> <p>Aptly taken care off.</p> <p>Minor rectification has been done keeping in view that excess content on single sub-topic may deviate the concerned from actual review.</p> <p>A brief introduction on Nutrigenomics has been included in text.</p> <p>Aptly taken care off.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Figure 1: check graph, the picture is somehow misleading in that “nutraceuticals” is NOT a mixture of nutrient and drugs. The legend reads “nutraceuticals nutrients”(? meangingless) but it should be “nutraceuticals compound or concept” rather.</p> <p>Many mistakes in the wording of the probiotics.</p> <p>List of commercial names should be longer, otherwise as it may seem heavily biased. Some truly effective (i.e. sound published) probiotic should be mentioned such as Yakult (lactobacillus Casei Shirota – over 100 publication!) or ImmunAge (fermented papaya preparation, over 40 publications!) for the sake of scientific impact should be mentioned or, rather, delete all commercial names.</p>	<p>Aptly taken care off.</p> <p>Aptly taken care off.</p> <p>Aptly taken care off.</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>Overall, the paper need substantial fixing and updating before being reconsidered for publication.</p>	