www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART	1.

FART I.	
Journal Name:	British Journal of 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

<u>General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:</u>

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

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

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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		
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The animals were inbred or out bred or procured commercially. This information is important for repetition of the results, if someone would like to do so. How the authors arrived at the dose of 200 and 400 mg/kg of guduchi, no information has been provided? The careful look into the MS shows that it is 200 mg/kg that reduced the enzyme levels. Probably 100 mg/kg or less would have been still better. Tinospora alone groups are missing, which is essential for comparisons. It seems from the description that the authors administered guduchi satvas for four days before administration of paracetamol. What has been the basis for this regimen? Usually in Ayuredic system they shall be given 5 or 7 days prior to this type of studies. It is not clear from the description when paracetamol was administered in guduchi treated group. Was it on fourth day, if so how many hours after guduchi administration? Were the guduchi	
	satvas given after paracetamol administration or	

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

both before and after administration of	
paracetamol and how long?	
Why the animals were sacrificed after 48 h of	
paracetamol administration? Why not until the	
activities of enzymes and histology was restored to	
normalcy?	
Results	
Figure 1 does not provide any legend and these	
photomicrographs correspond, which dose of	
guduchi? Photomicrograph C is not really different	
than that of B however, authors state that it is near	
normal. Liver histology will not become normal in	
48 h.	
Table 1 shows % protection. However, no formula	
has been provided in the Materials and Methods	
section for its calculation. In the absence of data	
for guduchi alone groups the results cannot be	
regarded as authentic.	
There are several errors of reporting in results	
section. Line 170 pp 8 what is interesting about the	
non-significant results?	
Results of histology have not been represented in	
this section.	
Discussion	
The authors have not discussed their results on the	
available information of Tinospora. They have	
used other plants.	
References	
Wealth of literature is available on Tinospora,	
which authors tried to ignore. Out of 39 references	
which additions there to renote. Out of 57 ferenetes	

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

quoted by the authors only 7 belong to Tinosposra which is really strange. The manuscript is casually written and seriously flawed on experimental design as will be clear from the above. Therefore, I am unable to recommend this manuscript for publication in the British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research.	
---	--

Note: Anonymous Reviewer