

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_87850
Title of the Manuscript:	Costus afer Ker Gawl. (Costaceae): A review on its potential anti-inflammatory
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalipri.com/index.php/JPRI/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	The authors have combined in their review article a very large amount of information about herbal medicine by extracts Costus afer (C. afer) Ker Gawl. usually known as gingerlily or bush cane belongs to the Family of Zingiberaceae now known as Costaceae. However, it is premature to draw final conclusions about the expediency of using extracts of these plants, since there is completely no information about single and course doses of plant extracts and about dosage forms that were previously used in experimental and clinical studies (infusions, decoctions, teas, powders, tablets, etc.). In addition, there is no connection between these effects and the duration of the course of phytotherapy in animals and in humans.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	If possible, it is advisable to specify specific single and course doses, as well as dosage forms (infusion, decoction, tea or other) of dry (raw) vegetable raw materials or soluble extract (maybe even in packages), which has been used in experimental and clinical phytotherapy, or folk medicine in the regions of Africa.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The article is filled with very important information. This information is presented in the traditional form (without specifying the doses, dosage forms and duration of phytotherapy). At the same time, this disadvantage is a consequence of the disadvantage of articles that are in the references of this review. Therefore, the article in question can be published in the journal.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aleksandr Urakov
Department, University & Country	Izhevsk State Medical Academy, Russia