



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_29419
Title of the Manuscript:	HEPATOPROTECTIVE AND ANTIOXIDANT ACTIVITY OF AMORPHOPHALLUS CAMPANULATUS TUBERS EXTRACT AGAINST PARACETAMOL -INDUCED LIVER DAMAGE IN RATS
Type of the 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 entire manuscript needs serious overhauling. It is technically weak with no significant contributions to the existing scientific knowledge. The Authors claimed that the hepatoprotective activity of <i>A. campanulatus</i> has not been scientifically validated but a number of literatures like 'Sanjay Jain, Vinod K. Dixit, Neelesh Malviya and Vijay Ambawatia. 2009. Antioxidant and hepatoprotective activity of ethanolic and aqueous extracts of <i>Amorphophallus campanulatus</i> roxb. tubers. Acta Poloniae Pharmaceutica-Drug Research, Vol. 66 No. 4 pp. 423-428' have previously reported on hepatoprotective activity of <i>A. campanulatus</i>. Besides, the experimental design and technicalities involved are not encompassing. The manuscript is also full of grammatically inconsistencies from the abstract and throughout the entire write-up. It is very surprising to have seen methanolic extract emerging when what they actually used were decoction and maceration with water. The results on the acute toxicity study are missing. These and many more technical errors abound the manuscript. Ethical issues : They should provide ethical clearance number or reference	-Yes i do agree with the comment and i have removed the line stating that the hepatoprotective activity of <i>A. Campanulatus</i> has not been scientifically validated. -I have tried to redesign and encompass all the required informations. -Grammatical mistakes have been elimintaed. -Macerate with methanol and decocted with water. -The results on acute toxicity study has been provided -Ethical clearance no.has been provided.. Animal Ethical committee Number:IAEC/25/2007
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		