

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Research Journal of Natural Products
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SARJNP_84623
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Analgesic and Antipyretic activity of ethanolic leaf extract of Catharanthus roseus (Nayantara) in experimental animals
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:

(<https://journalsarjnp.com/index.php/SARJNP/editorial-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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Thanks Author for your research work but: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Did you depend on acute toxicity study of extract in determining the maximum dose? Refer to the experimental study that you depended on.- Because figure is simplest to understand, it is better to add figures of tables' contents, like figure of response between reaction time and observation time.- Include your discussion results of other similar researches and discussion the difference in results. For example, in your research there is no significant difference in rectal temperatures between groups while results of research [Vipin Kumar Garg* and Deepika Saini, Analgesic and antipyretic activity of ethanolic extract of leaves of Catharanthus Roseus, Der Pharmacia Lettre, 2016, 8 (18):48-52] included significant decrease in rectal temperature.	Noted Revision amended accordingly Correction made
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Change brackets of tables because [] brackets are commonly used for references numbers.- Give brief explanation with reference as a reason for main results like decreasing in writhing movements and increasing in % protection of extract.	Noted
<u>Optional/General</u> 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	