

www.sciencedomain.org

## **SDI Review Form 1.6**

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

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

• This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.

## PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of	Comment
	Pharmaceutical	
	Research	
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJPR_4003	
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative	
	hepatoprotective	
	potential of	
	Tinospora	
	cordifolia,	
	Tinospora	
	sinensis and	
	Neem-guduchi	
Type of the Article	Research paper	Original Article
Title	Comparative	In this Original Research Article, the authors have made a good attempt to explore

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (2<sup>nd</sup> June, 2012)

SCIENCEDOMAN

www.sciencedomain.org

# **SDI Review Form 1.6**

	hepatoprotective	the hepatoprotective potential of three species of Tinospora which were well	
	potential of	known for liver disorders in natural text. Author described the comparative	
Tinospora		study of these three and showed that satva of <i>Tinospora cordifolia</i> , <i>Tinospora</i>	
	cordifolia,	sinensis showed the significant activity as compared to Neem-guduchi at	
	Tinospora sinensis	200mg/kg i.p	
	•		
and Neem-gudud		Note: Similar evaluation done by Chavan et al., 2013 in different ways in which	
		Co authors Omkar Kulkarni is common and he will be very much aware with	
		both the studies. So kindly let us know that what is the difference between the	
		earlier published paper or novality of work	
Abstract		Need of modification	
Introduction		Need to revise, Line 45, 46 should be rewrite or add the reference of Chavan et	
		al., 2013 and author should have to explain the chemistry of the species which	
		will help to researcher's interest. Modification needs to reduce similarity	
Preparation of Guduchi Satwa		Line110-111 need to be check for spelling mistakes and language	
<b>Experimental animals</b>		Provide the size of animal cages and how many animals were in one cage.	
		Mention which OECD guidelines were followed by the Authors to perform these	
		experiments.	
Paracetamol-induced hepatic		How do you check the hepatic toxicity in the experimental animals? In the	
damage		abstract Authors mentioned the ip injection for drug administration but in	

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (2<sup>nd</sup> June, 2012)

SCIENCEDDMAN

www.sciencedomain.org

# **SDI Review Form 1.6**

Results	experimental animal it is oral administration (Text). What is the correlation between this? Kindly clarify. Author has to use at least three dose level but only used 2 dose levels 200 and 400mg/kg: explain.  Why the author did not perform acute toxicity studies
Intoxication	<ul> <li>Line 345: table: Normal control compared with paracetamol control and the significance of toxicity induction was not shown in the paracetamol group. Author should have to compare such a way that the paracetamol group shows their toxications.</li> <li>How does it possible to compare two grps with ANOVA followed by dunnets test: In this case student T test must be used. And after the significant induction of hepatotoxicty with Paracetamol author have to compare all groups with paracetamol grp. Please clarify this.</li> <li>What does the mean in III-VI grp (92) (83)(73) like that in different parameters. If it is percentage then why in some cases percentage is more than 100 and neem gudchi does not have any.</li> <li>Results clearly showed that all groups of test drugs decrease the all parameters as compared to paracetamol control but some of them are not significant to reduce these levels and there were no evidence of elevation of this parameters with the test drugs at 400mg/kg in all groups. Kindly clarify the results and discussion according to your results</li> </ul>
References	Need to be revise according to guidlines

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (2<sup>nd</sup> June, 2012)

SCIENCEDOMAIN

www.sciencedomain.org

## **SDI Review Form 1.6**

#### **PART 2:** Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Authors have made a good attempt to explore the	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)
	hepatoprotective potential of three species of Tinospora which were well known for liver disorders in natural text. Author described the comparative study of these three and showed that satva of <i>Tinospora cordifolia</i> , <i>Tinospora sinensis</i> showed the significant activity. The work has some interest and better than the previously published Chavan et al., 2013. A number of researches are going on the Tinospora and this paper will help in variety of ways. The manuscript can be accepted after the correction, addition and clarification of comment.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The manuscript can be accepted after the correction, addition and clarification of comment.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer