

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78899
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Hepatoprotective activity of whole fruit extracts of Luffa acutangula.var. amara and rhizome extracts of Rheum emodi in CCl4 - induced chronic hepatotoxicity
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1-Concern CCL4 in title and abstract must be written complete as Carbon tetrachloride</p> <p>2-why the author choose the CCL4 to study their cytotoxicity?</p> <p>3-the following phrases is duplicated :</p> <p>Animals</p> <p>Wistar rats weighing 160-200g, obtained from the Deccan College of Medical Sciences, Hyderabad, TS, India, were maintained by housing them under controlled temperature, humidity and 24- hr light and dark cycle before acclimatising them for seven days under controlled temperatures (23-25°C), humidity (60- 70%) and dividing them in groups of 6 animals each for carrying out hepatoprotective studies using crude extracts- after approval of all experimental protocols from the ethics committee.</p> <p>4- Authors not mention use of silymarin in abstract and why they use it if they need to evaluate the fruit extracts of Luffa acutangula.var. amara and rhizome extracts of Rheum emodi</p> <p>5- it seem that the silymarin have more effect than the fruit extracts of Luffa acutangula.var. amara and rhizome extracts of Rheum emodi but not highlighted</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Revision made</p> <p>Noted</p>
Optional/General comments		

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>	