SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_59159**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Solubility of Calcium Phosphate Crystallization in vitro in presence of Basella rubra Deproteinized Concoction used in non-codified medicine for Urinary stones**
Type of the Article	**Short 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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy)

SDI 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	In introduction, perhaps, it would be convenient to justify why the antiurolithic activity of the plant is evaluated. Are there reports in folk medicine for the treatment of lithiasis? Carefully check the spelling. In the Preliminary Phytochemical Screening *Potassium dichomate test The correct way is Potassium dichromate test Are there any other current references to the methodology used in testing the effect of solubility on calcium phosphate? So that another researcher can reproduce the described experiments The results speak of an inhibitory effect at the nucleation stage. Perhaps in order to ensure this effect, it would be convenient to carry out a nucleation spectrophotometric assay. The conclusions are somewhat biased, since the preliminary phytochemical examination is not sufficient to determine the presence of secondary metabolites. Is the order of the cited references according to the format requested by the journal?	**Answer is given under** **Section 2. Materials and Methods** **2.1. Plant Material.** **Yes. there are reports in Non-codified medicine and Literature too.** **Typing error. Corrected.** **Yes, Many. (Given in References)** **It is an primary process responsible in all the experiments of stone and for discussion also. So it was mentioned. Nucleation and Aggregation tests are in progress, may be communicated in future to the same journal "Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International" after the completion of research including all other methods of *in vitro* screening and *in vivo* methods. That is why this article is claimed for an Short Research Article.** **Yes. Only qualitative and primary method of phytochemical screening was included. Quantitative analysis is in progress. Keeping in mind, this manuscript is prepared for Short research article, we stopped here in writing for other methods.** **"Framing the manuscript according to the authors guidelines is not mandatory for initial submission of manuscripts" This is the statement given during Submission by Journal members. That is why the manuscript is not framed accordingly.**
Optional/General comments	I consider it important to evaluate the antiurolithic effect on other types of crystals Other research focuses only on calcium oxalate crystals, since it is not the only type of crystals in urolithiasis. This research can be reinforced in the future with an in vivo model using the foreign body insertion method in the bladder with which phosphate stones are formed	**Yes, research activity is in progress** **Yes, research activity is in progress**

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)* I do not consider this to be the case as it does not involve animal or human protocols	No ethical issues