

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_71232
Title of the Manuscript:	Ayurvedic perspectives towards Nidra (Sleep) and its significance
Type of the Article	

**General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

**PART 1: 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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>Although the article raises an interesting topic, it is written in a very incomprehensible way and it is not easy to follow the ideas of the authors.</p> <p>It lacks the purpose and description of the basic assumptions. The reason for writing this article is not fully understood. There are no references to tables in the text and it is difficult to grasp it. Overall, it’s chaos here.</p> <p>After reading all of this, I feel confused.</p> <p>Diagrams that would help you get an idea of the topic would be helpful. Besides, I believe that the notation of the quoted literature is not always correct, especially references to books.</p> <p>For the article to have cognitive value, a description of the mechanisms would be useful, simply a deeper analysis of the issues presented. The article is currently of popular science value. On the other hand, in my opinion, it is understandable only to researchers deeply involved in the subject. People who are unfamiliar with this issue will not understand much, so the article must be thoroughly reformulated.</p>	<p>Amended revision</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Revised</p> <p>Done</p>
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>A linguistic correction is needed. Many prepositions are missing, so the article should definitely be checked and revised in this regard.</p>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>