

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	Original Research

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.	The current research work is so important beacuase, 1. Since the Modern medicine like Paracetamol , ibuprofen and other NSAIDs are having severing toxicities, we are inn need of alternative drugs with less toxicities and more potency. 2. Herbal drugs are traditional and based on the culture and faith, hence strong scientific validation is required. 3. The simple and authenticated biological experimental models are highly needed to prove the therapeutic efficiency of any drugs.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Add some numerical value of the parameters done.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	No detail about statistical evaluation in methodology section. Statistical evaluation is mandatory to confirm the result. Likewise, discussion part is very short, and detailed explanations are required.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, but the discussion part doesn't have any reference.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Statistical evaluation and analysis of data is highly required. Without that results are meaningless. The author has done students T test , which is not enough to conifrm, multiple group comparision need post Hoc ANOVA tests.	

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	V. Thirumalai
Department, University & Country	Rajas Dental College And Hospital, India