

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_86478
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF ANTI-INFLAMMATORY MEDICATION ON INDOLEAMINE 2,3 DIOXYGENASE ACTIVITY
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>This is an interesting manuscript with preliminary results. The comments below are only intended to improve the wording for better understanding, maintaining the quality of the Journal. It is strongly suggested a revision of the manuscript following the editorial norms of the Journal (it is possible to see the use of different spaces between the lines and punctuation errors). An English language review is also recommended.</p> <p>Abstract <i>Methodology:</i> According to the International System of Units (SI) it must exist a space between the number and the measuring unit, this should be reviewed through the manuscript, and also “h” is certainly the SI symbol for hours. It must be considered the use of “were separated” in the first sentence. By general rule it must be avoided the use of abbreviations in the abstract, a suggestion to the authors is to declare the (IDO) at its first mentioned in the objective. <i>Results:</i> It should be checked the use of was instead of were since the activity was measured in one type of enzyme. <i>Conclusion:</i> The conclusions should be written in the past tense.</p> <p>Introduction It must be considered the use of “&” in a scientific manuscript. It must be declared the meaning of NSAIDs at their first appearance. It could be interesting if the authors can provide a figure/scheme with a general representation of the metabolic route or chemical structure/main reactions under study.</p> <p>Materials & Methods It may be considered to replace “was take place” with “took place”. A suggestion is to mention the Faculty, University, or Institute where the research was developed by its an extended name. The symbol for gram is g.</p> <p>Results Tables or Figures are presented in the text once mentioned. If the authors are referring to Table 1, it must appear after the mention in the corresponding paragraph, the same with Table 2.</p> <p>Discussion The authors describe the results found and then compare them with the specialized literature, but never offer an opinion on what could be happening at the biochemical-physiological level. Could the authors suggest some mechanism, metabolic pathway, and synthesis/degradation of compounds that are related directly or indirectly in the results?</p> <p>Conclusions The recommendation is to rewrite the current conclusion with some values from the results. In this way, it appears more concise and reaffirms a scientific result.</p> <p>References The citation of the literature and the references must be adapted to the Journal edition requirements.</p>	<p>Done Done</p> <p>Done Done Done Done</p> <p>Done Done Done</p> <p>Done Done Done</p> <p>Done Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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