



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJPR_4003
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative hepatoprotective potential of <i>Tinospora cordifolia</i>, <i>Tinospora sinensis</i> and Neem-guduchi
Type of the Article	Research paper

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



SDI Review Form 1.6

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.

PART 2: 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>)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>There is no mention of name of experimental animal in Materials and methods. What was the proportion of guduchi and neem in guduchi-neem satwa? Why guduchi and neem were mixed when no data to support hepatoprotective effect of neem has been shown?</p> <p>Following work is from the same institute. Chavan T, Khadke S, Harke S, ET AL.Satwa from three <i>Tinospora</i> species exhibits differential hepatoprotective activity against repeated acetaminophen dosing in rats. Journal of Pharmacy research. 2013;6:123-128. In what way your work differs from this work?</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Line 1- I disagree with statement that liver diseases are a world wide health problem. In India medicinal plants and their formulations are common for the treatment of liver ailments in Ayurvedic system. Line 79- use 'are' instead of 'is'. Line 187- The sentence 'The estimation of serum bilirubin associated normal liver function ' is meaning less and incomplete.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer