

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JPRI_130251 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Evaluation of the Anti-Pyretic Effects of Ethanolic Extract of Sonchus wightianus DC using wistar rats |
| Type of the Article | |

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

| | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
|--|---|---|
| Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | Why choice ethanolic extracts? Mention all possible extractive values with different solvents used. All the research methodology and discussion is not proper. | Noted |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | Tittle is not defined properly. | Revised |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | Abstract aim is not matched with manuscript tittle. Abstract write up not correct. Change whole abstract and rewrite. manuscript key words change with another word thus scientific community | Corrected |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | Need more reference in methodology section. Methodology improvement necessary | Revision made |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | English quality require improvement in methodology and discussion section | |
| Optional/General comments | 1. Preliminary phytochemical screening methodology not describe large and make short in two lines. 2. Abbreviation used more in whole manuscript. 3. Reference should be added in whole sections and subsections of manuscript. 4. Write up Grammer wrong in methodology section | Ok corrected |

PART 2:

| | 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> |
|--|--|--|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |