



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_29032
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of a Hydro-ethanolic Extract of Scoparia dulcis on Systemic Inflammation and Cachexia in an Allergic Asthma Model
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:

(<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 (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The authors have done an interesting work for the manuscript entitled "Effects of a Hydro-ethanolic Extract of <i>Scoparia dulcis</i> on Systemic Inflammation and Cachexia in an Allergic Asthma Model". They described the preliminary data about the beneficial effects of plant extracts of SDE in some parameters whose alteration is related with systemic inflammation as occurs in the chronic allergic lung diseases. This makes this plant extract as potential therapeutic agent in the management of allergic asthma or chronic obstructive pulmonary diseases, however, authors need to address the following important concerns: -It seems, according with the information in the Introduction section, that available data on the usage of SDE in the traditional management of allergic asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary diseases are anecdotal. Authors should complete this point and clarify the reasons of its limited use and if this could be related with adverse effects in humans. -In this work, the authors analyze the effects of hydro-ethanolic extract of SDE in an ovalbumin-induced allergic guinea-pig asthma model by the measure of some biomarkers of systemic inflammation as well as changes in body weight. But what symptoms present these animals to the respiratory tract level and more importantly could SDE extracts reverse them? -The point 3.1 of the result section must be completed.	Authors appreciate acknowledgement of work done. The word "anecdotal" used in the introduction section has been removed, as some research works have been done on the plant including its safety for use (as referenced). Work on the effects of SDE in airway inflammation as well as airway hyper-responsiveness and hyper-reactivity in allergic asthma and COPD on-going and results yet expected. Section completed and Table duly included. SDE versus prednisolone appropriately linked and discussed.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The authors should include a Table that shows in detail the phytochemical screening of SDE. -The discussion section needs to be completed. The authors should explain in detail the advantages and disadvantages of hydro-ethanolic extract of SDE <i>versus</i> prednisolone and other drugs routinely used in the treatment of chronic allergic lung diseases. -The authors should check carefully the abbreviations of the manuscript. Abbreviations should be defined at the first occurrence in the text.	Abbreviations used in manuscript cross-checked and appropriately defined at the first occurrence.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	This work has a number of minor comments that should be considered: -Abstract line 1: replace “COPD” for “chronic obstructive pulmonary diseases”. -Line 19: insert coma after and before “therefore”. -Line 20: replace “progress” for “progression”. -Line 23: define COPD. -Line 25: using “Unfortunately” instead “Moreover”. -Line 25: replace “therapy is” for “therapies are”. -Line 26: replace “It is therefore...” for “Thus, it is...” -Line 31: remove “therefore”. -Line 38, 43, 44, 49, 247, 252 and 261: replace “<i>Scoparia dulcis</i>” for “SDE”. -Line 172: replace “in defending the body against...” for “in the body defence against...” -Line 180: insert coma after and before “therefore”. -Line 181: define WBCs. -Line 209: replace “C-reactive proteins” for “CRP”.	The word “COPD” has been removed instead. Coma inserted before and after. Word replaced COPD defined Word replaced Correction effected Suggestion effected Word removed Authors think that <i>S. dulcis</i> used should be maintained. This is because in lines 38, 43, 44 and 49, SDE was not yet defined as the plant extract. In lines 247, 252 and 261, the statements relate to the plant itself, but not the extract SDE specifically. Suggestion effected Coma inserted before and after WBCs defined Word replaced Word replaced Word removed
---------------------------------------	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	-Line 220: replace “is said” for “seems”. -Line 221: remove “therefore”. -Line 223: using “Interestingly” instead “Also”. -Line 224: replace “is said” for “seems”. -Line 231-234: Clarify what you are trying to say. This last sentence should be rewritten. -Line 235: remove “Again”. -Line 241: replace “reactive oxygen species” for “ROS”. -Line 252: replace “...implies it has the potential of scavenging...” for ““... could scavenge...””. -Line 262: replace “,” for “;”. -The manuscript requires extensive revision of the English language (both grammar and vocabulary).	Suggestion effected Authors think word used should be maintained; as this is in reference to previous works (cited) Statement rewritten for clarification. Word removed Word replaced Suggestion effected Sentence restructured for modification, per suggestion by another reviewer. Authors have taken notice of English language and have made all necessary corrections where possible.
Optional/General comments		